

Course-Section: IS 101 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1013
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	11	17	7	3.56	1492/1674	3.56	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	21	12	4.10	1077/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	15	13	3.78	1162/1423	3.78	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	7	16	10	3.67	1371/1609	3.68	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	12	12	10	3.55	1193/1585	3.55	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	7	10	11	8	3.36	1349/1535	3.36	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	14	19	4.15	977/1651	4.15	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	17	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	26	6	3.95	1056/1656	3.95	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	8	27	4.63	708/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	10	23	4.47	1250/1585	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	10	25	4.55	578/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	2	9	23	4.34	876/1575	4.34	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	4	10	22	4.32	440/1380	4.32	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	607/1520	4.29	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	746/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	798/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	0	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	577/ 994	3.88	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: IS 101 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1013
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: OZOK, ANT

Fall 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 14

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1015
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	5	6	3	3.56	1492/1674	3.56	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	856/1674	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	943/1423	4.13	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1366/1609	3.69	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	996/1585	3.81	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	3	4	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	6	1	3.46	1394/1656	3.46	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	5	2	6	3.80	1524/1585	3.80	4.72	4.69	4.60	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	8	2	3.80	1272/1582	3.80	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1010/1575	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	363/1380	4.43	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1010/1520	3.78	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1210/1511	3.78	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: IS 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1015
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 125 0101
 Title INFO SYS LOGIC/DESIGN
 Instructor: VYAS, AMRISH J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1016
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

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	7	5	4.31	891/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	446/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	250/1423	4.77	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	539/1585	4.27	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	419/1651	4.58	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1484/1673	4.17	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	171/1586	4.92	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1130/1585	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	453/1575	4.69	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	234/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	454/1520	4.45	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	949/1515	4.18	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	696/1511	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	708/ 994	3.57	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: IS 125 0101
 Title INFO SYS LOGIC/DESIGN
 Instructor: VYAS, AMRISH J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1016
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 202 0101
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO
 Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1017
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	7	10	4.17	1046/1674	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	7	3.96	1208/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	878/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1029/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	2	8	3	3	3.17	1400/1585	3.30	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	870/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	598/1651	4.54	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	693/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	763/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	1035/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	967/1582	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	949/1575	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	0	3	3	8	3.61	992/1380	4.31	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	385/1520	4.76	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	513/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	626/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: IS 202 0101
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO
 Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1017
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 202 0201
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO
 Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1018
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 247J 0101
 Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffre
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1019
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	830/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	771/1423	4.48	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.40	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	612/1585	4.10	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1535	4.76	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	330/1651	4.65	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	794/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.65	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	495/1575	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.42	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	3.67	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.20	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 247J 0201
 Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
 Instructor: BURALL, KYLE B
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1020
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1291/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.48	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1007/1609	4.40	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	769/1585	4.10	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1535	4.76	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1651	4.65	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	723/1586	4.65	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1061/1582	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1289/1575	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	666/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1315/1520	3.42	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1361/1515	3.67	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1265/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	847/ 994	3.20	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	257/ 265	3.00	4.06	4.23	4.34	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	259/ 278	3.00	4.21	4.19	4.36	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	260/ 260	2.50	4.43	4.46	4.51	2.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	259/ 259	2.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	2.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	232/ 233	2.50	4.36	4.20	4.48	2.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: IS 247J 0201
 Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
 Instructor: BURALL, KYLE B
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1020
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 247S 0101
 Title PROGRAMMING IN SAS
 Instructor: FORGIONNE, GUIS
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1021
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
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
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 247V 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS
 Instructor: SMITH, DANA H
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1022
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 247V 0201
 Title SELECTED TOPICS
 Instructor: SMITH, DANA H
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1023
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	490/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	769/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	737/1535	4.04	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	966/1651	4.48	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	522/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1423/1585	4.39	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.57	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1010/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
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
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 247V 0301
 Title SELECTED TOPICS
 Instructor: TARI, FURKAN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1024
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	367/1674	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	338/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	335/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	363/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	432/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	643/1535	4.04	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	151/1651	4.48	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	618/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1035/1585	4.39	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1582	4.57	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	565/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	100/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	760/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	788/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 2
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 295 0301
 Title INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA
 Instructor: NOORUDDIN, AAMI
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1025
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	243/1674	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1674	4.82	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	203/1423	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	242/1609	4.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	277/1585	4.76	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	169/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1182/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	207/1656	4.45	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	538/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	106/1582	4.90	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1575	4.94	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1380	4.93	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	645/1520	4.24	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	384/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	610/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 295 0401
 Title INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA
 Instructor: NOORUDDIN, AAMI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1026
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	1	12	4.41	751/1674	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	325/1674	4.82	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	322/1423	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	292/1609	4.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	69/1585	4.76	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	131/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	419/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1470/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	805/1656	4.45	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	633/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	786/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	180/1582	4.90	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	203/1575	4.94	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	96/1380	4.93	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	0	10	4.23	663/1520	4.24	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	1002/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	685/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	432/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14

Course-Section: IS 298I 0101
 Title Intro to Programming T
 Instructor: Canfield, G.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1027
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	1628/1674	3.54	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1653/1674	3.54	4.26	4.23	4.26	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1316/1423	3.71	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1452/1609	3.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	3.25	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1504/1651	3.92	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1169/1673	4.69	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1641/1656	3.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	2.56	1571/1586	3.60	4.43	4.43	4.48	2.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1582/1585	3.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	2.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	2	1	0	2.22	1576/1582	3.41	4.30	4.26	4.35	2.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	2	0	0	2.00	1562/1575	3.13	4.32	4.27	4.39	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1190/1380	3.81	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1513/1520	2.63	4.14	4.01	4.03	1.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	1512/1515	2.74	4.37	4.24	4.28	1.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	1491/1511	3.35	4.37	4.27	4.28	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	

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 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
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: IS 298I 0201
 Title Intro to Programming T
 Instructor: Noiker, R.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1028
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: IS 298I 0201
 Title Intro to Programming T
 Instructor: Noiker, R.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1028
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 300 0101
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT A
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1029
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	903/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	554/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	404/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	629/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	326/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	467/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	795/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1470/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	507/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1034/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	917/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	313/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	265/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	635/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	603/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	618/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	148/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 300 0201
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SMITH, DANA H
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1030
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	841/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	578/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	16	4.38	718/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	7	13	4.19	930/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	502/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	5	14	4.29	619/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	15	4.36	727/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	8	4.32	1368/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	744/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	816/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	1118/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	704/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	755/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	4	5	13	4.17	567/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	244/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	681/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	171/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	337/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.31	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 300 0301
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: PENTRY, PHILIP L
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1031
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	11	10	4.04	1171/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	882/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	13	8	4.00	1016/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	6	9	3.67	1377/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	5	15	4.11	692/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	8	5	10	3.81	1110/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	0	5	17	4.22	901/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	8	4.30	1390/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	10	9	2	3.62	1324/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	723/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	1309/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	956/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	915/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	7	2	3	3	4	2.74	1294/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	2.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	7	4	10	3.58	1141/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	8	4	8	1	6	2.74	1461/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	2.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	9	3	8	0	7	2.74	1467/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	2.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	19	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	795/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	4.50	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	3.75	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	4.25	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	3.75	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 49	3.50	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 61	4.50	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 50	4.60	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	4.50	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 31	4.50	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 300 0301
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: PENTRY, PHILIP L
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1031
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 300 0401
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: RADA, ROY
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1032
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	7	10	3.79	1393/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	6	13	4.07	1097/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	5	6	12	4.21	887/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	10	11	4.15	974/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	15	4.25	557/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	11	12	4.26	667/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	8	15	4.25	866/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	26	4.86	796/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	3	7	7	7	3.75	1237/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	6	8	8	4.00	1300/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	1374/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	6	8	7	3.83	1261/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	2	3	4	5	7	3.57	1355/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	3	3	4	8	3.65	968/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	924/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	513/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1050/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 28 Non-major 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 8	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 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 300 0501
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: HOLDEN, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1033
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 300 8020
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1034
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	878/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	931/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	845/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	743/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	360/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	807/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	628/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	496/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1328/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	733/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	819/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	639/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1002/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1158/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	937/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	4	0	3	2	3.33	811/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	150/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	49/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	4.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 76	4.50	3.36	3.98	4.03	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	44/ 77	3.75	3.65	3.93	3.70	3.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	39/ 53	4.25	4.19	4.45	3.87	4.25	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	33/ 48	3.75	3.86	4.12	3.67	3.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	40/ 49	3.50	3.74	4.27	3.27	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	26/ 61	4.50	4.03	4.09	3.20	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	3.50	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	26/ 50	4.60	4.23	4.44	3.82	4.60	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	19/ 35	4.50	4.22	4.36	3.29	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	16/ 31	4.50	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.50	

Course-Section: IS 300 8020
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1034
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 303 0101
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1035
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	1	0	2	3	4	8	5	3.50	1511/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	9	8	3.87	1298/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	636/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	2	5	4	6	3.40	1297/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	667/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	2	10	3.86	1258/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	778/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	7	7	1	3.50	1377/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	1191/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	7	9	4.05	1109/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1138/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	3	2	13	4.25	489/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	1421/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1476/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	2.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1420/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	732/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 303 0101
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1035
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 303 0201
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1036
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	4	7	5	3.45	1528/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	8	4	3.45	1519/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	6	9	4.00	1016/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1431/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	4	2	6	3.22	1376/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	3	4	5	4	3.47	1454/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	915/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	2	3	6	1	3.14	1513/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	1	5	10	4.05	1463/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1244/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	7	3.75	1289/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	272/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	955/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1233/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	390/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 303 0201
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1036
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 303 0301
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1037
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 303 8020
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: DeVreis, Esther
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1038
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	963/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	495/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	167/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	

Course-Section: IS 303 8020
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: DeVreis, Esther
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1038
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 304 0101
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1039
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: IS 304 0101
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1039
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 304 0201
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1040
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	768/1674	4.51	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	870/1674	4.46	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	697/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.68	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1585	4.54	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.51	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	393/1651	4.13	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	4.42	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	692/1575	4.51	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	200/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.68	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	4.82	3.97	3.94	3.96	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 310 0101
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: REDDING, TATE
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1041
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	703/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	270/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	188/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	13	4.31	771/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	378/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	8	10	3.86	1057/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	186/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	13	13	4.50	381/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	86/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	366/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	423/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	200/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 11	C 1	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	28
			? 1		

Course-Section: IS 310 0201
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1042
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1581/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	3	3	2	2.86	1637/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	1340/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1439/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1023/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1317/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	6	4	2	3	3.13	1549/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	7	0	0	2.88	1584/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1224/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	1513/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1348/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	1	7	3.73	1299/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	880/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	4	2	1	3	3.09	1335/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1137/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	4	1	4	3.64	1278/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	2	0	0	2	2.43	972/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	2.43

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	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 310 0301
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: COMITZ, PAUL H.
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1043
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

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	2	11	16	4.25	954/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	18	4.44	689/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	9	18	4.39	718/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	8	15	4.06	1055/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	10	8	10	3.74	1058/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	7	9	10	3.63	1229/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	10	16	4.29	820/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	4.44	1278/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	9	11	4.12	882/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	389/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	397/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	438/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	23	4.55	646/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	1	9	16	4.13	594/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	751/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	847/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	594/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	396/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 310 8020
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: CHIANG, CHIYUNK
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1044
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	1056/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	1026/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	771/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	743/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	715/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	870/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	866/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1470/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	931/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1267/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	819/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	819/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	303/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	777/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1137/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	845/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	474/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 325 0101
 Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC
 Instructor: FORGIONNE, GUI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1045
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	768/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	460/1674	4.48	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.58	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.17	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.20	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1535	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1297/1656	3.94	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	858/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	4.65	4.30	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1380	4.55	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.34	****	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
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
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 325 0201
 Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC
 Instructor: ROBINSON, RANDA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1046
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	7	3	4.09	1123/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	790/1674	4.48	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	739/1423	4.58	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	743/1609	4.17	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	769/1585	4.20	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	703/1535	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1405/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	757/1656	3.94	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	882/1582	4.65	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	819/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1380	4.55	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 325 0201
 Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC
 Instructor: ROBINSON, RANDA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1046
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 350 0101
 Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1047
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	854/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	419/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	575/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	963/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	452/1585	4.32	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	471/1651	4.63	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1203/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	655/1656	4.32	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	981/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	236/1582	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	279/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	447/1380	3.90	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	572/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	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	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 350 0201
 Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffrey
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1048
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	916/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	495/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	310/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	530/1585	4.32	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	276/1651	4.63	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1289/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	615/1656	4.32	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1224/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	495/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1036/1380	3.90	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 350 0201
 Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffrey
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1048
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 387 0101
 Title WEB CONTENT DEVELOPMEN
 Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1049
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1056/1674	4.17	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	966/1651	4.17	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	7	1	3.58	1339/1656	3.58	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	931/1586	4.45	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	786/1585	4.82	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	755/1575	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	472/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 403 0101
 Title USER INTERFACE DESIGN
 Instructor: GOODALL, JOHN R
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1050
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	338/1674	4.69	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	718/1423	4.38	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	889/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	896/1585	4.77	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	599/1582	4.54	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	915/1575	4.31	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	253/1380	4.58	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	4.17	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	7	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	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 410 0101
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: MCGINNIS, JOSEP
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1051
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	7	15	4.54	558/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	776/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	376/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	743/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	413/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	747/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	15	4.33	768/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	641/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	560/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	960/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	567/1582	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	624/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	406/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	901/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	778/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	553/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 410 0101
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: MCGINNIS, JOSEP
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1051
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 410 0201
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: YOON, VICTORIA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1052
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	14	10	4.31	891/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	13	9	4.19	1001/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	11	4.00	1016/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	7	9	8	3.96	1146/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	7	9	3.87	946/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	757/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	6	11	4.00	1097/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	0	23	4.76	944/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	10	3	3.84	1169/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	11	14	4.46	916/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	811/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	924/1582	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	975/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	385/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	810/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	857/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	955/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	346/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 410 0201
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: YOON, VICTORIA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1052
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 410 0301
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: Chen, Zhiyaun
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1053
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	854/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	830/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	575/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	701/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1175/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	524/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	774/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1387/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1320/1582	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1216/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	938/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	936/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	707/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	581/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 11
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 413 0101
 Title GUI SYSTEMS USING JAVA
 Instructor: EMURIAN, HENRY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1054
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	342/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	314/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1423	4.93	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	715/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	1374/1535	3.29	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	832/1651	4.29	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	565/1673	4.93	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	131/1656	4.85	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	467/1582	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	259/1520	4.71	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.88	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.17	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C 1	General 6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 420 0101
 Title DATABASE APPL DEVELOP
 Instructor: KARABATIS, GEOR
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1055
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General	1
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	25
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 420 0201
 Title DATABASE APPL DEVELOP
 Instructor: BANDARU, PRAKAS
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1056
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 420 8020
 Title DATABASE APPL DEVELOP
 Instructor: BANDARU, PRAKAS
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1057
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	830/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	963/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	578/1535	4.40	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1377/1651	4.24	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1074/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1354/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1025/1582	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1040/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	845/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.30	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.23	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	638/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 425 0101
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1058
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	3	1	5	14	8	3.74	1411/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	13	4.16	1026/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	6	8	12	3.87	1121/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	11	11	4.14	985/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	1360/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	7	7	10	3.66	1212/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.66	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	10	13	4.03	1077/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	987/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	9	9	4.00	955/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	9	14	4.33	1074/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	3	8	14	4.26	1397/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	2	9	13	4.27	924/1582	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	10	11	4.07	1111/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	2	3	6	12	3.96	718/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1043/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	930/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1030/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	652/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 425 0101
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1058
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 425 0201
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: ZHANG, DONGSONG
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1059
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	485/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	310/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	614/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	512/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	608/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	351/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	955/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	693/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1094/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	690/1582	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	692/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	303/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	379/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	402/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	638/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.75	

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 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: IS 425 8020
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: DeVreis, Esther
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1060
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	575/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	330/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	390/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.20	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 430 0101
 Title INFO SYSTEMS & SECURIT
 Instructor: DIAMOND, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1061
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4	Required for Majors 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 436 0201
 Title STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI
 Instructor: NORCIO, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1062
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	7	4	3.67	1449/1674	3.83	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	9	3.95	1208/1674	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	861/1423	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	1172/1609	3.90	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	8	4	3.43	1282/1585	3.34	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	7	6	3.95	961/1535	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	432/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	7	4.29	1397/1673	4.53	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	7	6	7	4.00	955/1656	3.70	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1250/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1166/1585	4.46	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	1181/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	1	7	7	3.89	1220/1575	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	5	2	2	4	3.07	1211/1380	3.46	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	700/1520	3.48	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	408/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	618/1511	4.02	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	600/ 994	3.83	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 436 0301
 Title STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1063
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1196/1674	3.83	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1475/1674	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	894/1423	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1254/1609	3.90	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1364/1585	3.34	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1048/1535	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	1240/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	929/1673	4.53	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1421/1656	3.70	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1354/1585	4.46	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1228/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1423/1575	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	831/1380	3.46	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1434/1520	3.48	4.14	4.01	4.18	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1209/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1308/1511	4.02	4.37	4.27	4.45	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 436 0301
 Title STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1063
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 438 0101
 Title PROJECT MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: RICHBURG, TASHA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1064
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	404/1585	4.42	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	419/1651	4.58	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	757/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	567/1380	4.17	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1520	4.71	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511	4.86	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	131/ 994	4.71	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	

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 3		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 440 0101
 Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC
 Instructor: LEWIS, CLARENCE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1065
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1618/1674	3.90	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1535/1674	3.99	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1401/1423	2.75	4.36	4.27	4.34	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	1	3.08	1552/1609	3.97	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	4	0	2.75	1517/1585	3.75	4.04	3.96	4.01	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	2	4	0	2.78	1490/1535	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.18	2.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	3	3	0	2.55	1608/1651	3.42	4.20	4.18	4.23	2.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	868/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	1	2	3.20	1494/1656	3.68	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1430/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1535/1585	4.35	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1464/1582	4.15	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1474/1575	4.05	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	4	1	0	1	2.25	1347/1380	3.63	3.94	3.94	4.04	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	4.58	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	629/1515	4.75	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	937/ 994	2.80	3.97	3.94	4.19	2.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	5.00	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 440 0101
 Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC
 Instructor: LEWIS, CLARENCE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1065
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 440 0201
 Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC
 Instructor: EMURIAN, HENRY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1066
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: IS 448 0101
 Title MARKUP & SCRIPTING LAN
 Instructor: CANFIELD, GERAL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1067
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1026/1674	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1642/1674	2.80	4.26	4.23	4.31	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1413/1423	2.40	4.36	4.27	4.34	2.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1603/1609	2.50	4.23	4.22	4.30	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1297/1585	3.40	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1499/1535	2.67	4.08	4.08	4.18	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1537/1651	3.20	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1592/1656	2.80	4.06	4.07	4.19	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1528/1586	3.20	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1559/1585	3.40	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1543/1575	2.60	4.32	4.27	4.35	2.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1311/1380	2.60	3.94	3.94	4.04	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1488/1520	2.33	4.14	4.01	4.18	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1507/1515	1.67	4.37	4.24	4.40	1.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1510/1511	1.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	1.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 4	Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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: IS 450 0101
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: MEISE, JOHN D
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1068
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	979/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1083/1674	3.95	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	750/1423	4.02	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	771/1609	4.03	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	8	3	4	3.39	1306/1585	3.52	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1092/1535	3.65	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	866/1651	4.07	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	1040/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1056/1656	3.93	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1421/1586	3.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	713/1585	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	9	4	5	3.63	1359/1582	3.69	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	793/1575	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	666/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	645/1520	4.13	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	523/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	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 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 450 0201
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffre
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1069
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	9	5	3.90	1322/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1340/1674	3.95	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	4	7	3.68	1203/1423	4.02	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	4	7	3.75	1320/1609	4.03	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	6	5	3.65	1128/1585	3.52	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	11	4	3	3.47	1306/1535	3.65	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1228/1651	4.07	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1090/1656	3.93	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	1275/1586	3.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	1183/1585	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	7	5	3.75	1302/1582	3.69	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	7	6	3.75	1289/1575	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	7	3	3	3.00	1217/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	810/1520	4.13	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1197/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 450 0201
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffrey
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1069
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 451 0101
 Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1070
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	6	9	4.41	751/1674	4.52	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1401/1674	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1226/1423	4.14	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1313/1609	4.26	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	557/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	945/1651	4.59	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	958/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1237/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1054/1586	4.68	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1166/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1199/1582	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1274/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	845/1380	4.35	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1210/1520	4.11	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1374/1515	3.84	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1166/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 451 0101
 Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1070
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 451 0201
 Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1071
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

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	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 451M 0201
 Title LAN MGT USING MICROSOFT
 Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1072
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	13	4.71	354/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	325/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	505/1423	4.56	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1377/1609	3.67	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	593/1585	4.21	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	351/1651	4.65	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1434/1673	4.24	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	912/1656	4.07	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	523/1515	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	614/ 994	3.80	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 451M 0201
 Title LAN MGT USING MICROSOFT
 Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1072
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 451U 0101
 Title LAN MGMT USING UNIX
 Instructor: PELKEY, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1073
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/1423	4.64	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	0	2	1	0	2.00	1572/1585	2.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	471/1651	4.55	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	463/1380	4.29	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	

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

Course-Section: IS 452C 0101
 Title
 Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1074
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	980/1674	4.21	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	750/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1355/1609	3.70	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	907/1585	3.91	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1267/1535	3.56	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1537/1673	4.08	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	1104/1586	4.31	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	798/1582	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	742/1575	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	576/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	942/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		10
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 474 8020
 Title LEGAL ASPECTS OF IS
 Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1075
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	431/1423	4.63	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.88	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.86	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50	

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

Course-Section: IS 498A 0101
 Title Acctg Info Systems
 Instructor: Eisenman S.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1076
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	519/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1423	4.89	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.89		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1048/1535	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	808/1582	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1080/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	143/1380	4.75	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 498B 0101
 Title Program for Biomed Inf
 Instructor: Liu, H.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1077
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: IS 498B 0101
 Title Program for Biomed Inf
 Instructor: Liu, H.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1077
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 600 0101
 Title IS IMPLEMENTATION
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1078
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	4	1	3.44	1531/1674	3.44	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1475/1674	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1326/1423	3.29	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1377/1609	3.67	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1267/1585	3.44	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	929/1673	4.78	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1168/1586	4.22	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1452/1575	3.22	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	810/1380	3.89	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1284/1520	3.25	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1267/1515	3.63	4.37	4.24	4.47	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1004/1511	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	784/ 994	3.40	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	132/ 265	4.33	4.06	4.23	4.51	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	130/ 278	4.33	4.21	4.19	4.42	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.33	4.43	4.46	4.67	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.53	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	69/ 101	4.33	4.33	4.48	4.62	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	3.76	4.14	4.26	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	46/ 77	3.67	3.65	3.93	4.31	3.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	35/ 53	4.33	4.19	4.45	4.64	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	4.59	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 50	4.33	4.23	4.44	4.64	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	21/ 35	4.33	4.22	4.36	4.84	4.33	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	18/ 31	4.33	4.25	4.34	4.64	4.33	

Course-Section: IS 600 0101
 Title IS IMPLEMENTATION
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1078
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 601 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF IS
 Instructor: GUO, ZHILING
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1079
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	8	6	5	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	1118/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1341/1609	3.73	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	7	4	3.38	1306/1585	3.38	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	12	4	3.76	1140/1535	3.76	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	2	6	4	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	887/1673	4.81	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	4	7	4	3	3.21	1490/1656	3.21	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	1230/1586	4.14	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	1367/1585	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	5	7	3	3.35	1453/1582	3.35	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	5	5	3.32	1429/1575	3.32	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	4	9	5	3.71	930/1380	3.71	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	930/1520	3.89	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	847/1515	4.32	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	886/1511	4.26	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: IS 601 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF IS
 Instructor: GUO, ZHILING
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1079
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	5	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 603 0101
 Title DECISION MAKING SUPPOR
 Instructor: ZHANG, DONGSONG
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1080
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	432/1674	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	445/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	799/1609	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	622/1585	4.19	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	528/1535	4.39	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	382/1651	4.61	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	207/1656	4.73	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	510/1582	4.61	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	612/1380	4.12	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	529/1520	4.39	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	707/1511	4.44	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	976/ 994	2.11	3.97	3.94	4.07	2.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	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	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	916/1674	4.28	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	9	4.12	1060/1674	4.12	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	739/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	0	3	6	7	3.48	1245/1585	3.48	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	215/1535	4.70	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	4	15	4.24	1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	5	15	4.32	1361/1585	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	9	8	3.91	1208/1582	3.91	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	6	13	4.13	1070/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	5	1	5	7	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	878/1520	3.95	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	966/1515	4.16	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	1144/1511	3.89	4.37	4.27	4.49	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: IS 620 0101
 Title ADV DATABASE PROJECTS
 Instructor: Chen, Zhiyaun
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1081
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 636 0101
 Title STRUC SYS ANALY & DES
 Instructor: NORCIO, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1082
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	979/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	956/1674	4.24	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	2	7	3.81	1278/1609	3.81	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	575/1585	4.24	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	528/1535	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1188/1651	3.94	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1390/1673	4.29	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	1158/1585	4.59	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	892/1582	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	1030/1575	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1280/1380	2.80	3.94	3.94	3.85	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	379/1520	4.53	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	289/1511	4.87	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	773/ 994	3.43	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: IS 636 0101
 Title STRUC SYS ANALY & DES
 Instructor: NORCIO, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1082
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 650 0101
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: LIU, HONGFANG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1083
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	378/1585	4.44	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	154/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	458/1651	4.56	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	805/1586	4.56	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.78	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	817/1380	3.88	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	960/1515	4.17	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	977/ 994	2.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: IS 706 0101
 Title INFO. VISUALIZATION
 Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1084
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1459/1674	3.64	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1043/1674	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	750/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	879/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	8	2	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	8	5	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1093/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1054/1586	4.36	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	853/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1043/1582	4.14	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1060/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	346/ 994	4.29	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 707 0101
 Title INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGI
 Instructor: ZHOU, LINA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1085
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	1066/1674	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	870/1674	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	974/1423	4.08	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	974/1609	4.15	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	512/1585	4.31	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	777/1535	4.15	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1050/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	826/1586	4.54	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	0	3	7	4.08	1094/1582	4.08	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	975/1575	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	635/1380	4.08	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	708/ 994	3.57	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 731 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC COMMERCE
 Instructor: OZOK, ANT
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1086
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	6	5	3.62	1474/1674	3.62	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	7	4	3.43	1531/1674	3.43	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	3	1	4	6	2	3.19	1344/1423	3.19	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	10	5	3.85	1254/1609	3.85	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	2	9	2	2.95	1465/1585	2.95	4.04	3.96	4.23	2.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	8	4	2	3.31	1362/1535	3.31	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	4	8	3.76	1317/1651	3.76	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	944/1673	4.76	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	12	0	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1250/1586	4.11	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	1142/1585	4.60	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	7	5	3.79	1284/1582	3.79	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	5	8	4	3.63	1339/1575	3.63	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	1028/1380	3.53	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	9	4	3.83	967/1520	3.83	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	960/1515	4.17	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	553/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 14	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 15	Under-grad 7	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

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	1	1	0	10	1	3.69	1434/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1246/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1313/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1100/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1309/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	3.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1214/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1297/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	8	1	3.62	1457/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1258/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1336/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	8	1	3.46	1381/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	930/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	734/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	681/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	685/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	732/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	74/ 103	****	4.00	4.41	4.33	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	90/ 101	****	3.71	4.48	4.18	3.71	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	82/ 95	****	3.43	4.31	3.99	3.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	92/ 99	****	3.29	4.39	4.10	3.29	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	81/ 97	****	3.43	4.14	3.69	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

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	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	768/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	542/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	540/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1055/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	722/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	631/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	643/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	827/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	633/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	567/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	847/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	522/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	397/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	313/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	414/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	287/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	3.71	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	3.43	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	3.29	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.43	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	38/ 76	****	4.20	3.98	3.32	4.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	42/ 77	****	3.87	3.93	3.42	3.87	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	2	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	39/ 53	****	4.23	4.45	4.34	4.23	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	33/ 48	****	3.77	4.12	4.00	3.77	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	31/ 49	****	4.18	4.27	4.30	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant