

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	1	3	18	4.65	406/1481	4.51	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	192/1481	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	261/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.14	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	193/1424	4.51	4.20	4.21	4.06	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	3	3	1	1	2	2.60	1358/1396	2.71	3.35	3.98	3.89	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	832/1342	3.68	4.05	4.07	3.88	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	344/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	825/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.64	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	431/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	169/1409	4.49	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	450/1407	4.72	4.67	4.69	4.57	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	502/1399	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	229/1400	4.49	4.19	4.27	4.19	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	411/1179	4.19	3.98	3.96	3.85	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	570/1262	3.36	3.92	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	6	2	7	4.07	878/1259	3.73	4.10	4.29	4.06	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	785/1256	3.82	4.05	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	487/ 788	3.91	3.90	4.00	3.80	3.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 368  
 JUN 13, 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	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 369  
 JUN 13, 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	20	4.62	439/1481	4.51	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	458/1481	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	20	4.55	451/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.14	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	485/1424	4.51	4.20	4.21	4.06	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	6	2	3	4	2	2.65	1354/1396	2.71	3.35	3.98	3.89	2.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	695/1342	3.68	4.05	4.07	3.88	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	168/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	14	8	4.04	819/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	6	17	4.41	891/1409	4.49	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	842/1407	4.72	4.67	4.69	4.57	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	4	14	4.08	976/1399	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	6	16	4.19	921/1400	4.49	4.19	4.27	4.19	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	1	7	15	4.27	434/1179	4.19	3.98	3.96	3.85	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	1	4	1	5	3.29	1074/1262	3.36	3.92	4.05	3.77	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	715/1259	3.73	4.10	4.29	4.06	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	901/1256	3.82	4.05	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	9	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 788	3.91	3.90	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 369  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	29	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0501  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 370  
 JUN 13, 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	0	5	8	4.27	831/1481	4.51	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	736/1481	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	788/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.14	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	728/1424	4.51	4.20	4.21	4.06	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1330/1396	2.71	3.35	3.98	3.89	2.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	5	1	3	3.00	1269/1342	3.68	4.05	4.07	3.88	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	3	9	4.13	881/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	491/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.64	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1174/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1098/1409	4.49	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	1107/1407	4.72	4.67	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	929/1399	4.26	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	636/1400	4.49	4.19	4.27	4.19	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	590/1179	4.19	3.98	3.96	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	7	0	0	2.56	1218/1262	3.36	3.92	4.05	3.77	2.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	6	0	1	2.78	1205/1259	3.73	4.10	4.29	4.06	2.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1148/1256	3.82	4.05	4.30	4.08	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 788	3.91	3.90	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 8	Required for Majors	2 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2 C 0	General	4 Under-grad 15 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 371  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	103/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	0	4	3.20	1218/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	91/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	825/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	417/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	116/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	218/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	104/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	659/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	729/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	571/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	89/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	40/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 371  
 JUN 13, 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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 372  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	103/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	0	4	3.20	1218/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	91/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	825/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	487/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	659/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	729/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	571/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	89/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	40/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 372  
 JUN 13, 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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 373  
 JUN 13, 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	8	4.67	395/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	422/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	498/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	395/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	1	3	1	0	2.11	1390/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	854/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	692/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	963/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	480/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	312/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	299/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1127/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1206/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	67/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	66/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	73/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	66/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	

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	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 374  
 JUN 13, 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	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1199/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	295/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	895/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	773/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	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.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 375  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	395/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	437/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1167/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	276/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1107/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	591/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	510/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	708/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 376  
 JUN 13, 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	1	4.50	549/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1083/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1107/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	894/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	113/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	198/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 377  
 JUN 13, 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	210/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	1384/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	208/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1190/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1027/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1084/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	787/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	1.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	40/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	5.00	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	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: CMSC 201 0203  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 378  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1394/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	1.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	931/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	729/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	901/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	781/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	5.00	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0204  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 379  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	395/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	773/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1292/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	550/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1153/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	855/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	969/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	259/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1059/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1152/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1156/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	147/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	142/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	48/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0301  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 380  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1006/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1179/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	788/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	959/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1374/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1166/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	909/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1133/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	762/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1107/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1163/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	977/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	359/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	295/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	588/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	809/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	116/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	114/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	159/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	137/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	94/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0301  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 381  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1006/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1179/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	788/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	959/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1374/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1166/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	909/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	753/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1269/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	295/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	588/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	809/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	116/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	114/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	159/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	137/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	94/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0302  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 382  
 JUN 13, 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	749/1481	4.61	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	822/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	742/1249	4.65	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	908/1424	4.56	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	2	3	1	2.80	1341/1396	2.75	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.41	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	695/1459	4.55	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1025/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	836/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	762/1409	4.79	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.77	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	910/1399	4.59	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	692/1400	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	495/1179	4.32	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	677/1262	4.04	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1052/1259	4.05	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1097/1256	3.93	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	3.25	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	116/ 246	4.47	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	114/ 249	4.55	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	84/ 242	4.81	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	137/ 240	4.80	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	94/ 217	4.40	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 11

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 383  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	805/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	790/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	432/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	706/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1353/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	755/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1086/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	836/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	682/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1053/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	659/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	421/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	726/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	76/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	103/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	66/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	1	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 384  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1315/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	942/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	992/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	885/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1337/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1071/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	460/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1055/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	924/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1200/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1110/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1283/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	793/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	507/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1069/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	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	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0104  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 385  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	844/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	498/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1167/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1340/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1337/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1017/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	134/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1081/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1209/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1145/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	145/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	210/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	780/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1136/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	807/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	2	4	0	3.00	1292/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	755/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	695/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1267/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	383/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	963/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	753/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	791/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	840/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	842/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	895/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1012/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	130/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	76/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	113/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	103/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	120/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 202 0105  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: WORTMAN, DANA T  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 386  
 JUN 13, 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 387  
 JUN 13, 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	5	5.00	1/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	884/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1212/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1298/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1395/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	1.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1039/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1228/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	997/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	683/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	590/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	507/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1162/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1233/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	155/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	246/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	2.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	212/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 388  
 JUN 13, 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	5	5.00	1/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	884/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1212/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1298/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1395/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	1.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1039/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1228/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	997/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1152/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1017/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	590/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	507/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1162/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1233/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	155/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	246/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	2.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	212/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	918/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	893/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	959/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	877/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1115/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	611/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	648/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	590/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	958/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	821/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1084/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0203  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 390  
 JUN 13, 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	3	9	4.54	522/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	917/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1005/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	557/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	901/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	242/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1029/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	702/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1131/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	804/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	703/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	729/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	340/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	134/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	723/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	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	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0204  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 391  
 JUN 13, 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	395/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	893/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	959/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1368/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1101/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1158/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	910/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	791/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	739/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	931/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1162/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0205  
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 392  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	264/1481	4.39	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1102/1249	3.74	4.24	4.27	4.36	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	840/1424	4.05	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	502/1396	2.82	3.35	3.98	3.94	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1186/1342	3.63	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1459	4.08	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480	4.77	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	334/1450	4.25	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	311/1399	4.39	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	844/1400	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	323/1179	4.07	3.98	3.96	4.05	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1081/1262	4.02	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	3.86	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1134/1256	3.67	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	155/ 246	4.37	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	224/ 249	3.89	4.29	4.11	4.32	3.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	113/ 242	4.82	4.82	4.40	4.63	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	225/ 240	4.09	4.54	4.20	4.58	2.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	66/ 217	4.03	4.24	4.04	4.28	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	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	7	8	3.83	1206/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	589/1481	4.02	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	18	4.58	423/1249	4.36	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	6	4	11	4.24	762/1424	3.96	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	4	4	4	4	3.22	1210/1396	3.20	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	719/1342	3.87	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	344/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	761/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	290/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	919/1407	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	743/1399	3.83	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	7	13	4.41	704/1400	3.97	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	2	3	0	5	3.55	880/1179	3.48	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	877/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1036/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	992/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 393  
 JUN 13, 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	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 394  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	652/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	11	4.23	843/1481	4.02	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	7	14	4.42	611/1249	4.36	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1213/1424	3.96	4.20	4.21	4.28	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	3	7	1	5	3.22	1210/1396	3.20	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	755/1342	3.87	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	5	11	3.92	1030/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	281/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	3	12	5	3.86	1005/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.86	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	400/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	804/1407	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	8	10	6	3.84	1125/1399	3.83	4.25	4.26	4.29	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	13	9	4.12	977/1400	3.97	4.19	4.27	4.34	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	924/1179	3.48	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.44	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	829/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	846/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	901/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	

Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	

Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	7	4	3.70	1232/1481	4.02	4.27	4.23	4.29	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	7	6	4.00	893/1249	4.36	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1186/1424	3.96	4.20	4.21	4.28	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	7	6	1	3.05	1282/1396	3.20	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1166/1342	3.87	4.05	4.07	4.05	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	935/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	1124/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	891/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	1153/1407	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	9	6	2	3.35	1272/1399	3.83	4.25	4.26	4.29	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	9	4	6	3.75	1145/1400	3.97	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	17	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1179	3.48	3.98	3.96	4.05	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1092/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1158/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1059/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 2	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 1	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 3	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 2	Under-grad	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0401  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: NIRUNBERG, SERG  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 396  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	4	5	3.75	1254/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1242/1481	4.02	4.27	4.23	4.29	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	586/1249	4.36	4.24	4.27	4.36	4.44		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	840/1424	3.96	4.20	4.21	4.28	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	6	2	3.29	1188/1396	3.20	3.35	3.98	3.94	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	755/1342	3.87	4.05	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	929/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	6	1	3.43	1258/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1104/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	963/1407	4.65	4.67	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1145/1399	3.83	4.25	4.26	4.29	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1204/1400	3.97	4.19	4.27	4.34	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	3	4	3	3	3.46	914/1179	3.48	3.98	3.96	4.05	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	995/1262	3.58	3.92	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1043/1259	3.69	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	901/1256	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.17	3.90	4.00	3.98	****	

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	6	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 291A 0101  
 Title PRINCIPLES OF EE LAB  
 Instructor: YAN, LI  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 397  
 JUN 13, 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	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.33	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.27	4.23	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.20	4.21	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	3.35	3.98	3.94	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.21	4.16	4.17	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.25	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.98	3.96	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.05	4.30	4.28	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.00	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	145/ 249	4.00	4.29	4.11	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.82	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.54	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	129/ 217	4.00	4.24	4.04	4.28	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 398  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	2	7	7	6	3.35	1404/1481	3.34	4.33	4.29	4.29	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	5	3	11	5	2	2.85	1449/1481	2.96	4.27	4.23	4.23	2.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	6	9	6	3	3.16	1177/1249	3.28	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	3	7	5	8	3.78	1170/1424	3.62	4.20	4.21	4.27	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	1	11	3	5	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	8	1	3	5	4	3	3.31	1192/1342	3.46	4.05	4.07	4.12	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	7	7	5	5	3.24	1339/1459	3.22	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	0	3	19	1	3.79	1435/1480	3.73	4.75	4.68	4.65	3.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	6	9	1	2	2.67	1417/1450	2.83	4.10	4.09	4.10	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	5	10	5	1	2.83	1381/1409	2.78	4.46	4.42	4.43	2.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	4	6	4	10	3.83	1334/1407	3.98	4.67	4.69	4.67	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	8	6	4	1	2.50	1381/1399	2.62	4.25	4.26	4.27	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	4	9	3	1	2.59	1356/1400	2.56	4.19	4.27	4.28	2.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	6	3	8	5	1	2.65	1116/1179	2.94	3.98	3.96	4.02	2.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	3.00	3.92	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1259	3.00	4.10	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	2.20	4.05	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 399  
 JUN 13, 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	4	4	5	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.34	4.33	4.29	4.29	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	4	2	3.07	1415/1481	2.96	4.27	4.23	4.23	3.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1136/1249	3.28	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1284/1424	3.62	4.20	4.21	4.27	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	4	3	3.62	1065/1342	3.46	4.05	4.07	4.12	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	3	2	3.20	1348/1459	3.22	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	8	2	3.67	1446/1480	3.73	4.75	4.68	4.65	3.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	1	4	2	3.00	1354/1450	2.83	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	7	2	1	2.73	1388/1409	2.78	4.46	4.42	4.43	2.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1288/1407	3.98	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	5	2	2	2.73	1365/1399	2.62	4.25	4.26	4.27	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	4	2	1	2.53	1361/1400	2.56	4.19	4.27	4.28	2.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1005/1179	2.94	3.98	3.96	4.02	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.92	4.05	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	4.10	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1241/1256	2.20	4.05	4.30	4.34	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201  
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 399  
 JUN 13, 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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	10				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: MCSHANE, MARGE  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 400  
 JUN 13, 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	3	8	11	4.26	831/1481	4.20	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	560/1481	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	442/1249	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	11	11	4.35	633/1424	4.17	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	3	3	3	5	3.00	1292/1396	3.32	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	695/1342	4.16	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	390/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.62	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	15	4	4.10	786/1450	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	319/1409	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	880/1407	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	491/1399	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	397/1400	4.22	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	259/1179	4.28	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0201  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 401  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	976/1481	4.20	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	4	7	3.67	1253/1481	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.23	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	8	3.95	936/1249	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	3	2	5	8	4.00	959/1424	4.17	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	0	3	5	6	3.65	998/1396	3.32	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	573/1342	4.16	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	5	4	8	3.76	1148/1459	4.16	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	1230/1480	4.62	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	808/1450	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	9	8	4.05	1140/1409	4.43	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	1194/1407	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	9	4	6	3.62	1213/1399	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.27	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	4	6	7	3.76	1140/1400	4.22	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	570/1179	4.28	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 402  
 JUN 13, 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	8	15	4.52	531/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	469/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	561/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	863/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	3	8	2	2	2.83	1337/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	5	0	3	4	3.50	1115/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	276/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	319/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.52	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	94/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	591/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	335/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	385/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	10	7	4.05	576/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.05	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 403  
 JUN 13, 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	14	4.78	268/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	324/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	334/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	406/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1250/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	474/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	231/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	281/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.57	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	113/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	300/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	300/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	349/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	340/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.40	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 404  
 JUN 13, 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	7	14	4.42	665/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	589/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	647/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	784/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1048/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	354/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	623/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	756/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	712/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	716/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	1046/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	713/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	741/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	315/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	931/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	836/1259	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1012/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0401  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: PENG, YUN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 405  
 JUN 13, 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	4	4.38	708/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	374/1481	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	647/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	863/1424	4.26	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	985/1396	3.30	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.26	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	321/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	630/1450	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	762/1409	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1008/1407	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	713/1399	4.54	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	468/1400	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	259/1179	4.35	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	708/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	895/1259	4.08	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	901/1256	3.92	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 406  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	600/1481	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	246/1481	4.58	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	470/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	364/1424	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	6	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	626/1342	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1295/1480	4.56	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	525/1450	4.16	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	450/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	591/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1399	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	492/1400	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	590/1179	4.06	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	437/1262	4.28	3.92	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1259	4.65	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	216/1256	4.68	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	501/ 788	4.09	3.90	4.00	4.07	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	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	1
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	14
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 407  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	12	6	4.05	1043/1481	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	736/1481	4.58	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	788/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	416/1424	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	5	4	5	3.14	1255/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	5	6	3.50	1115/1342	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	6	6	3.76	1148/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	4.55	1025/1480	4.56	4.75	4.68	4.65	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	8	3	3.82	1038/1450	4.16	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	935/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	1107/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	892/1399	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	6	6	3.81	1120/1400	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	5	10	4	3.71	820/1179	4.06	3.98	3.96	4.02	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	708/1262	4.28	3.92	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	524/1259	4.65	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	603/1256	4.68	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	318/ 788	4.09	3.90	4.00	4.07	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		



Course-Section: CMSC 345 0301  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: PETERSON, SPENC  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 408  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	225/1481	4.44	4.33	4.29	4.29	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	299/1481	4.58	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	334/1249	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	437/1424	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	707/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	206/1342	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.12	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	155/1459	4.29	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.56	4.75	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	578/1450	4.16	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	319/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	568/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	431/1399	4.51	4.25	4.26	4.27	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	397/1400	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	291/1179	4.06	3.98	3.96	4.02	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.28	3.92	4.05	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.65	4.10	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1256	4.68	4.05	4.30	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	318/ 788	4.09	3.90	4.00	4.07	4.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 409  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	4	8	3.90	1162/1481	4.10	4.33	4.29	4.45	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	884/1481	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	639/1249	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	863/1424	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	2	4	5	3.50	1083/1396	3.53	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	603/1342	4.19	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	332/1459	4.68	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	8	4	3.79	1072/1450	4.05	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	800/1409	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	1019/1407	4.68	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	8	2	8	3.67	1196/1399	4.07	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	3	8	3.67	1183/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	2	5	7	3.50	894/1179	3.97	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201  
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 410  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	9	14	4.30	792/1481	4.10	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	505/1481	4.35	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	287/1249	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	706/1424	4.21	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1054/1396	3.53	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	603/1342	4.19	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	203/1459	4.68	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	281/1480	4.98	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	557/1450	4.05	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	500/1409	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	842/1407	4.68	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	590/1399	4.07	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	561/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	315/1179	3.97	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

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 1	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General	0
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	26
			? 2		

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 411  
 JUN 13, 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	3	3	13	18	4.24	857/1481	4.34	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	18	13	4.13	934/1481	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	9	16	11	3.97	919/1249	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	7	10	15	4.09	918/1424	4.11	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	11	15	3.94	763/1396	3.97	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	2	4	7	10	3.96	819/1342	4.02	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	11	16	4.08	919/1459	4.23	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	0	1	33	4.81	839/1480	4.90	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	10	13	10	4.00	836/1450	4.18	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	10	23	4.53	739/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	10	24	4.57	1061/1407	4.64	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	17	14	4.22	855/1399	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	15	14	4.17	937/1400	4.32	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	2	8	9	7	3.70	827/1179	3.89	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 38 Non-major 1
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 34	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 412  
 JUN 13, 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	18	23	4.43	639/1481	4.34	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	14	25	4.36	704/1481	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	17	23	4.34	671/1249	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	7	13	17	4.13	885/1424	4.11	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	8	11	17	4.00	707/1396	3.97	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	2	7	10	14	4.09	701/1342	4.02	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	12	26	4.39	635/1459	4.23	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	43	5.00	1/1480	4.90	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	15	18	4.35	525/1450	4.18	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.35	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	5	36	4.74	433/1409	4.64	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	34	4.72	880/1407	4.64	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	10	28	4.51	556/1399	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	11	27	4.47	636/1400	4.32	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	8	11	16	4.08	563/1179	3.89	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.08	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 14	General	0
84-150	30	3.00-3.49 20	D 0		Under-grad 44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	41
			? 2		

Course-Section: CMSC 431 0101  
 Title COMPILER DESIGN PRINC  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 413  
 JUN 13, 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	5	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1133/1480	4.38	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1021/1179	3.17	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	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: CMSC 433 0101  
 Title SCRIPTING LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 414  
 JUN 13, 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	0	2	27	4.93	111/1481	4.93	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	121/1481	4.90	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	190/1249	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	148/1424	4.88	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	493/1396	4.26	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	101/1342	4.84	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	107/1459	4.90	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	131/1409	4.93	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	200/1407	4.97	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	162/1399	4.86	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	21	4.52	581/1400	4.52	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	162/1179	4.69	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 17	Under-grad 30 Non-major 0
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101  
 Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 415  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1037/1481	4.06	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	979/1481	4.06	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	757/1249	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	4	1	1	3	3.10	1272/1396	3.10	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	1	12	4.47	505/1459	4.47	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	792/1450	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	801/1399	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1101/1400	3.87	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	187/1179	4.64	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101  
 Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 415  
 JUN 13, 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 416  
 JUN 13, 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	7	2	1	2.92	1466/1481	3.63	4.33	4.29	4.45	2.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1000/1481	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	548/1249	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	595/1424	3.90	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	1276/1396	3.49	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1084/1342	3.79	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.62	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	3	0	2.90	1386/1450	3.35	4.10	4.09	4.28	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	3.62	1279/1409	4.03	4.46	4.42	4.51	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1318/1407	4.37	4.67	4.69	4.79	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	2	2	3.23	1297/1399	3.64	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	6	0	1	2.58	1357/1400	3.31	4.19	4.27	4.38	2.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	997/1179	3.25	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
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	13
			? 2		

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201  
 Title ALGORITHMS  
 Instructor: COLE, FLOYD  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 417  
 JUN 13, 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	6	13	4.33	749/1481	3.63	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1106/1481	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	7	5	3.46	1127/1249	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	7	2	2	3.42	1295/1424	3.90	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	6	4	7	3.89	816/1396	3.49	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	755/1342	3.79	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	14	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	12	11	4.33	1158/1480	4.62	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	3	12	3	3.80	1055/1450	3.35	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	852/1409	4.03	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	682/1407	4.37	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	987/1399	3.64	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	8	10	4.04	1004/1400	3.31	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1179	3.25	3.98	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

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 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 13	General	23
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 1		Non-major 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	18

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

Course-Section: CMSC 443H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 418  
 JUN 13, 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	2	15	4.72	328/1481	4.72	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	255/1481	4.72	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	228/1249	4.78	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	302/1424	4.65	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	675/1396	4.06	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	61/1459	4.94	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1065/1480	4.47	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	494/1450	4.39	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.39	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	633/1409	4.61	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	541/1400	4.56	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	712/1179	3.88	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.88	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1262	3.60	3.92	4.05	4.33	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 446 0101  
 Title DESIGN PATTERNS  
 Instructor: TARR, ROBERT M  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 419  
 JUN 13, 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	14	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	422/1481	4.59	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	451/1249	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	695/1424	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	675/1396	4.06	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	504/1342	4.30	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	403/1450	4.45	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	705/1407	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	502/1399	4.56	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	404/1179	4.31	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.92	4.05	4.33	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	7
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101  
 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA  
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 420  
 JUN 13, 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	14	4.52	531/1481	4.52	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	166/1249	4.87	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	256/1424	4.71	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	5	7	5	3.70	959/1396	3.70	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	257/1342	4.58	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	5	12	4.26	766/1459	4.26	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	296/1450	4.55	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	400/1409	4.76	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	601/1399	4.48	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	480/1400	4.62	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	705/1179	3.89	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1262	4.83	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 23 Non-major 0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 9	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 11	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101  
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM  
 Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 421  
 JUN 13, 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	12	9	4.12	986/1481	4.12	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	7	3.96	1047/1481	4.11	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	15	9	4.28	718/1249	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	959/1424	4.04	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	5	5	6	3.55	1054/1396	3.54	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	424/1342	4.24	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	10	10	4.13	890/1459	4.21	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1	22	4.79	847/1480	4.87	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	8	10	1	3.63	1174/1450	3.63	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	9	10	4.08	1128/1409	4.06	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	1184/1407	4.29	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	10	9	4.04	987/1399	3.85	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	10	7	3.88	1098/1400	3.87	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	786/1179	3.75	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	5
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	11	9	4.13	986/1481	4.12	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	822/1481	4.11	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	13	4.33	679/1249	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	9	4.08	918/1424	4.04	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	7	6	3.52	1071/1396	3.54	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	11	6	4.10	695/1342	4.24	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	732/1459	4.21	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.87	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	7	11	2	3.62	1184/1450	3.63	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	9	9	4.04	1140/1409	4.06	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	1279/1407	4.29	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	6	10	3	3.67	1196/1399	3.85	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	6	8	6	3.86	1104/1400	3.87	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	3	7	6	3.74	806/1179	3.75	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	



Course-Section: CMSC 461 0201  
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM  
 Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 422  
 JUN 13, 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	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 475 0101  
 Title NEURAL NETWORKS  
 Instructor: PENG, YUN  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 423  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1179/1481	3.80	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	980/1249	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	816/1396	3.89	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	909/1459	4.10	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	6	0	3.56	1206/1450	3.56	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1069/1407	4.56	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1105/1399	3.89	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1135/1400	3.78	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1027/1179	3.14	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101  
 Title: COMPUTER NETWORKS  
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 424  
 JUN 13, 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	17	6	4.08	1024/1481	4.08	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	18	5	4.04	987/1481	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	21	3	3.96	927/1249	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	13	5	3.92	1074/1424	3.92	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	11	8	4.04	681/1396	4.04	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	13	7	4.13	660/1342	4.13	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	561/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	13	9	4.19	692/1450	4.19	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	7	12	7	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	1137/1407	4.46	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	19	5	4.04	991/1399	4.04	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	9	14	1	3.54	1222/1400	3.54	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	5	15	2	3.56	873/1179	3.56	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	677/1262	4.09	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	391/1259	4.73	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	704/1256	4.36	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	526/ 788	3.78	3.90	4.00	4.26	3.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General 12	Under-grad 26 Non-major 5
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 483 0101  
 Title PARALLEL & DISTR PROCE  
 Instructor: MOTTELER, HOWAR  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 425  
 JUN 13, 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	9	2	4.08	1018/1481	4.08	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	395/1424	4.55	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	5	1	2	1	2.89	1330/1396	2.89	3.35	3.98	4.09	2.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	695/1342	4.10	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	535/1459	4.45	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1030/1450	3.83	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1031/1409	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1140/1179	2.40	3.98	3.96	4.07	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.92	4.05	4.33	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	846/1259	4.14	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	837/1256	4.14	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491D 0101  
 Title SPEC TOPIC IN COMP SCI  
 Instructor: YESHA, YELENA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 426  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1186/1424	3.75	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	554/1396	4.20	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1260/1480	4.20	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	4.40	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.60	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	704/1400	4.40	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.05	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.90	4.00	4.26	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491E 0101  
 Title EMBEDDED SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: BURT, GARY  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 427  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	1330/1481	3.58	4.33	4.29	4.45	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	918/1424	4.08	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	869/1396	3.82	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	2	7	3.92	871/1342	3.92	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1324/1480	4.10	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1055/1450	3.80	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1264/1409	3.70	4.46	4.42	4.51	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	956/1399	4.11	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1095/1400	3.89	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	419/1179	4.29	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.92	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.05	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.26	5.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	5	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	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 491L 0101  
 Title MACHINE LEARNING  
 Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 428  
 JUN 13, 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	24	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	18	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	169/1424	4.82	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	603/1396	4.14	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	12	16	4.57	257/1342	4.57	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	224/1459	4.71	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	12	4.43	1100/1480	4.43	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	139/1450	4.81	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	59/1400	4.96	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	570/1262	4.25	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	524/1259	4.58	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	394/1256	4.73	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 7 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 18	Under-grad 21 Non-major 3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 491M 0101  
 Title MALICIOUS SOFTWARE  
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 429  
 JUN 13, 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	0	4	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.63	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1091/1249	3.63	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	623/1396	4.13	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1011/1342	3.71	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.21	4.16	4.25	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	5	0	3.57	1199/1450	3.70	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	865/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1053/1407	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	929/1399	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	945/1179	3.53	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	5	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	4				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CMSC 491M 0101  
 Title MALICIOUS SOFTWARE  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 430  
 JUN 13, 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	0	4	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	0	2	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.63	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1091/1249	3.63	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	623/1396	4.13	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1011/1342	3.71	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.21	4.16	4.25	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1030/1450	3.70	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1399	4.27	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	913/1400	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	840/1179	3.53	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	3.92	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.10	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.05	4.30	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	5	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 491N 0101  
 Title INTRO NETWORK SECURITY  
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 431  
 JUN 13, 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	4	3	3.80	1225/1481	3.80	4.33	4.29	4.45	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.27	4.23	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1096/1249	3.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1108/1424	3.88	4.20	4.21	4.35	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	633/1396	4.11	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	672/1342	4.13	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1228/1459	3.60	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.10	4.09	4.28	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1264/1409	3.70	4.46	4.42	4.51	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.25	4.26	4.36	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1256/1400	3.40	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.90	4.00	4.26	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491V 0101  
 Title ELECTRONIC VOTING SYS  
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 432  
 JUN 13, 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	0	1	5	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	909/1481	4.17	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.24	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	854/1396	3.83	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1101/1459	3.83	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1281/1480	4.17	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.19	4.27	4.38	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	793/1179	3.75	3.98	3.96	4.07	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	3	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: CMSC 491W 0101  
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC  
 Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 433  
 JUN 13, 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	12	4.86	196/1481	4.89	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	349/1481	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	923/1424	4.44	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1109/1396	4.00	3.35	3.98	4.09	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	858/1342	4.23	4.05	4.07	4.21	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	775/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	334/1450	4.69	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1409	4.93	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.96	4.67	4.69	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	311/1399	4.73	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	444/1400	4.74	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	162/1179	4.80	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	631/1262	4.52	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.77	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.85	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	133/ 788	4.58	3.90	4.00	4.26	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0201  
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC  
 Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 434  
 JUN 13, 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	11	4.92	143/1481	4.89	4.33	4.29	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	162/1481	4.74	4.27	4.23	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	178/1424	4.44	4.20	4.21	4.35	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	274/1396	4.00	3.35	3.98	4.09	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	277/1342	4.23	4.05	4.07	4.21	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	460/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.92	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1450	4.69	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1409	4.93	4.46	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.67	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	267/1399	4.73	4.25	4.26	4.36	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	218/1400	4.74	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	88/1179	4.80	3.98	3.96	4.07	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	138/1262	4.52	3.92	4.05	4.33	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.77	4.10	4.29	4.57	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1256	4.85	4.05	4.30	4.60	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	176/ 788	4.58	3.90	4.00	4.26	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	7	9	11	3.87	1187/1481	3.87	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	12	13	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.27	4.23	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	12	11	4.03	881/1249	4.03	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.03	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	16	8	3.83	1138/1424	3.83	4.20	4.21	4.16	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	6	2	8	9	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	7	11	7	3.53	1101/1342	3.53	4.05	4.07	4.18	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	20	4.43	565/1459	4.43	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	3	25	4.73	896/1480	4.73	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	1	3	11	10	3.96	890/1450	3.96	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	9	15	4.28	1019/1409	4.28	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	2	7	17	4.24	1260/1407	4.24	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	13	12	4.21	874/1399	4.21	4.25	4.26	4.16	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	10	15	4.30	829/1400	4.30	4.19	4.27	4.17	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	5	9	13	4.10	557/1179	4.10	3.98	3.96	3.81	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	3	6	3	3.47	1010/1262	3.47	3.92	4.05	4.07	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1067/1259	3.67	4.10	4.29	4.30	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	876/1256	4.07	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	9	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.82	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.54	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.24	4.04	3.73	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101  
 Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT  
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 435  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	16	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101  
 Title DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH  
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 436  
 JUN 13, 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	7	8	7	3.79	1230/1481	3.79	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	8	4	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	7	4	4	2	2.46	1237/1249	2.46	4.24	4.27	4.24	2.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	4	4	6	4	1	2.68	1405/1424	2.68	4.20	4.21	4.16	2.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	839/1396	3.85	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	2	7	7	3.42	1160/1342	3.42	4.05	4.07	4.18	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	5	9	6	3.58	1233/1459	3.58	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	4	4.17	1281/1480	4.17	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	6	7	2	3.20	1320/1450	3.20	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	4	12	4	3.67	1270/1409	3.67	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	3	10	7	3.79	1340/1407	3.79	4.67	4.69	4.73	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	5	8	4	3.33	1277/1399	3.33	4.25	4.26	4.16	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	5	8	5	3.38	1261/1400	3.38	4.19	4.27	4.17	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	4	2	7	2	2.95	1068/1179	2.95	3.98	3.96	3.81	2.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	3	2	8	1	3.50	995/1262	3.50	3.92	4.05	4.07	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	4	6	1	3.29	1141/1259	3.29	4.10	4.29	4.30	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	4.05	4.30	4.33	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.29	4.11	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 14
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 4		



Course-Section: CMSC 645 0101  
 Title ADV SOFTWARE ENGINEERI  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 437  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	1277/1481	3.71	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1404/1481	3.14	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1066/1249	3.71	4.24	4.27	4.24	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1251/1424	3.57	4.20	4.21	4.16	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	4	1	3.57	1042/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1011/1342	3.71	4.05	4.07	4.18	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1438/1459	2.00	4.21	4.16	4.01	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1443/1480	3.71	4.75	4.68	4.74	3.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1334/1407	3.83	4.67	4.69	4.73	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	4.25	4.26	4.16	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1269/1400	3.33	4.19	4.27	4.17	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	820/1179	3.71	3.98	3.96	3.81	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1092/1262	3.20	3.92	4.05	4.07	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1079/1259	3.60	4.10	4.29	4.30	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1084/1256	3.60	4.05	4.30	4.33	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.90	4.00	3.97	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0	Graduate	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	6
Grad.	3	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: CMSC 651 0101  
 Title AUTOMATA THRY/FORML LA  
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 438  
 JUN 13, 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	1	1	3.50	1358/1481	3.50	4.33	4.29	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.05	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	775/1459	4.25	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1294/1399	3.25	4.25	4.26	4.16	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.19	4.27	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1114/1179	2.67	3.98	3.96	3.81	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.92	4.05	4.07	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.10	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	4.43	4.20	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.29	4.11	3.93	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 652 0101  
 Title CRYPTOGRAPHY & DATA SE  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 439  
 JUN 13, 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	1	4	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1296/1481	3.57	4.27	4.23	4.11	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1327/1424	3.29	4.20	4.21	4.16	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.57	3.35	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1313/1342	2.83	4.05	4.07	4.18	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1086/1459	3.86	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.75	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1307/1409	3.43	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1245/1407	4.29	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.25	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.19	4.27	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.98	3.96	3.81	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1257/1262	1.50	3.92	4.05	4.07	1.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1247/1259	2.00	4.10	4.29	4.30	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1220/1256	2.50	4.05	4.30	4.33	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.90	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 0
Grad.	5	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: CMSC 691B 0101  
 Title BASIC RESRCH METHODS  
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 440  
 JUN 13, 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	10	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.33	4.29	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.27	4.23	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.24	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	217/1424	4.75	4.20	4.21	4.16	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.35	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	104/1342	4.83	4.05	4.07	4.18	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.75	4.68	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.25	4.26	4.16	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	511/1400	4.58	4.19	4.27	4.17	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	331/1179	4.42	3.98	3.96	3.81	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	570/1262	4.25	3.92	4.05	4.07	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.10	4.29	4.30	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	3.90	4.00	3.97	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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