

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100 1
Title:	Intro to Computer Scienc
Instructor:	Holder,Robert H

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	4	2	6	5	3.56	1386/1520	3.56	4.13	4.31	4.14	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	0	6	5	4	3.39	1408/1520	3.39	4.04	4.27	4.20	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	880/1291	4.17	4.20	4.33	4.24	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	1307/1483	3.56	4.08	4.23	4.09	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	1	4	3	5	3.38	1237/1417	3.38	3.55	4.08	4.02	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	7	4	3	3.29	1280/1405	3.29	3.91	4.12	3.96	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	7	4	3	3.35	1372/1504	3.35	4.12	4.16	4.13	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	753/1519	4.82	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	3	9	0	1	2.67	1472/1495	2.67	3.84	4.11	4.01	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1361/1459	3.67	4.25	4.47	4.40	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	3	5	8	3.94	1409/1460	3.94	4.53	4.74	4.68	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	9	2	3	3.11	1393/1455	3.11	3.96	4.32	4.26	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	1	8	4	3.50	1311/1456	3.50	3.96	4.34	4.26	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	1	3	6	5	3.50	1057/1316	3.50	3.79	4.03	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	881/1243	3.85	3.54	4.17	3.98	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	975/1241	3.92	3.64	4.33	4.14	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	947/1236	4.00	3.79	4.40	4.19	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 100 1
Title:	Intro to Computer Scienc
Instructor:	Holder,Robert H

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	553/889	3.89	3.58	4.02	3.89	3.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	6	13	4.04	1100/1520	4.09	4.13	4.31	4.14	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	4	7	10	3.77	1269/1520	3.91	4.04	4.27	4.20	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	8	8	5	3.46	1195/1291	3.94	4.20	4.33	4.24	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	2	6	6	5	3.48	1345/1483	3.71	4.08	4.23	4.09	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	14	4	0	3	1	2	2.70	1389/1417	3.08	3.55	4.08	4.02	2.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	3	1	1	6	0	2.91	1360/1405	3.07	3.91	4.12	3.96	2.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	3	6	13	4.17	848/1504	3.97	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1307/1519	4.74	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	10	8	2	3.21	1384/1495	3.57	3.84	4.11	4.01	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	10	9	4.04	1214/1459	3.94	4.25	4.47	4.40	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	11	9	4.08	1379/1460	4.32	4.53	4.74	4.68	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	9	6	4	3.30	1363/1455	3.46	3.96	4.32	4.26	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	3	9	7	3.70	1255/1456	3.81	3.96	4.34	4.26	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	0	4	10	5	3.64	1003/1316	3.58	3.79	4.03	3.91	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1132/1243	3.60	3.54	4.17	3.98	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1173/1241	3.64	3.64	4.33	4.14	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1157/1236	3.56	3.79	4.40	4.19	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 3	A 6	Required for Majors	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 4
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	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	2	1	12	4.06	1088/1520	4.09	4.13	4.31	4.14	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	1229/1520	3.91	4.04	4.27	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	3	10	4.06	949/1291	3.94	4.20	4.33	4.24	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	5	4	3	3.43	1363/1483	3.71	4.08	4.23	4.09	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	2	4	3	3.07	1336/1417	3.08	3.55	4.08	4.02	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	4	0	3	0	1	2.25	1395/1405	3.07	3.91	4.12	3.96	2.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	3	5	3	3.06	1427/1504	3.97	4.12	4.16	4.13	3.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1519	4.74	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	4	8	3	3.65	1217/1495	3.57	3.84	4.11	4.01	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	8	4	3.61	1373/1459	3.94	4.25	4.47	4.40	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	1278/1460	4.32	4.53	4.74	4.68	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	6	6	2	3.17	1384/1455	3.46	3.96	4.32	4.26	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	8	3.72	1245/1456	3.81	3.96	4.34	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	3	7	3	3.56	1034/1316	3.58	3.79	4.03	3.91	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	0	1	2	3.33	1115/1243	3.60	3.54	4.17	3.98	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1191/1241	3.64	3.64	4.33	4.14	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1173/1236	3.56	3.79	4.40	4.19	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 4
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 5
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Grasso,Clare T

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	5	5	14	4.19	983/1520	4.09	4.13	4.31	4.14	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	6	13	4.12	1013/1520	3.91	4.04	4.27	4.20	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	14	4.31	782/1291	3.94	4.20	4.33	4.24	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	842/1483	3.71	4.08	4.23	4.09	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	5	7	6	3.48	1198/1417	3.08	3.55	4.08	4.02	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	818/1405	3.07	3.91	4.12	3.96	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	242/1504	3.97	4.12	4.16	4.13	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1519	4.74	4.72	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	4	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	1060/1495	3.57	3.84	4.11	4.01	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	7	13	4.15	1162/1459	3.94	4.25	4.47	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	1195/1460	4.32	4.53	4.74	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	11	8	3.92	1144/1455	3.46	3.96	4.32	4.26	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	5	12	4.00	1094/1456	3.81	3.96	4.34	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	4	2	4	5	9	3.54	1041/1316	3.58	3.79	4.03	3.91	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	676/1243	3.60	3.54	4.17	3.98	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	615/1241	3.64	3.64	4.33	4.14	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	0	5	4	3.91	1017/1236	3.56	3.79	4.40	4.19	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 5
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Grasso,Clare T

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 5
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Grasso,Clare T

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 1	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	181
Questionnaires:	87

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	20	58	4.53	568/1520	4.42	4.13	4.31	4.36	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	9	19	54	4.42	709/1520	4.48	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	23	57	4.56	494/1291	4.57	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	2	10	15	44	4.33	724/1483	4.35	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	32	12	5	11	15	10	3.11	1326/1417	3.31	3.55	4.08	4.14	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	3	7	5	14	33	4.08	803/1405	4.18	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	4	18	56	4.44	516/1504	4.36	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	10	74	4.86	693/1519	4.91	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	1	6	25	33	4.38	508/1495	4.24	3.84	4.11	4.16	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	16	66	4.76	445/1459	4.72	4.25	4.47	4.52	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	10	70	4.79	845/1460	4.76	4.53	4.74	4.80	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	8	22	52	4.49	649/1455	4.45	3.96	4.32	4.39	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	8	16	55	4.45	746/1456	4.40	3.96	4.34	4.46	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	3	10	8	55	4.51	304/1316	4.28	3.79	4.03	4.18	4.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	2	8	27	33	4.12	724/1243	3.79	3.54	4.17	4.22	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	6	11	10	20	26	3.67	1086/1241	3.59	3.64	4.33	4.38	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	8	6	17	17	23	3.58	1122/1236	3.35	3.79	4.40	4.45	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	15	30	3	3	13	9	14	3.67	653/889	3.63	3.58	4.02	3.99	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	181
Questionnaires:	87

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	76	1	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	1	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	3	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	82	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	82	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	82	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	82	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	82	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	82	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	82	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	82	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	82	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	82	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 01
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	181
Questionnaires:	87

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	82	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	82	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	14	0.00-0.99 2	A 53	Required for Majors 72	Graduate 0 Major 36
28-55	18	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 87 Non-major 51
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives 3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 09
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	119
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	6	12	39	4.30	874/1520	4.42	4.13	4.31	4.36	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	14	42	4.53	541/1520	4.48	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	12	45	4.58	462/1291	4.57	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	8	13	33	4.38	669/1483	4.35	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	20	5	8	4	9	15	3.51	1182/1417	3.31	3.55	4.08	4.14	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	2	6	14	27	4.28	625/1405	4.18	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	10	16	33	4.27	726/1504	4.36	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	61	4.97	237/1519	4.91	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	10	27	15	4.10	828/1495	4.24	3.84	4.11	4.16	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	11	47	4.68	600/1459	4.72	4.25	4.47	4.52	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	9	49	4.73	962/1460	4.76	4.53	4.74	4.80	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	6	18	35	4.41	761/1455	4.45	3.96	4.32	4.39	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	6	9	40	4.34	855/1456	4.40	3.96	4.34	4.46	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	2	2	10	19	23	4.05	698/1316	4.28	3.79	4.03	4.18	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	8	10	16	16	3.46	1076/1243	3.79	3.54	4.17	4.22	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	5	8	13	11	17	3.50	1135/1241	3.59	3.64	4.33	4.38	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	14	4	9	13	13	3.13	1200/1236	3.35	3.79	4.40	4.45	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	7	31	2	4	2	11	6	3.60	679/889	3.63	3.58	4.02	3.99	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 09
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	119
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 09
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Lupoli,Shawn V

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	119
Questionnaires:	63

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 4	A 39	Required for Majors 55	Graduate 0 Major 31
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 63 Non-major 32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 01
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	230/1520	4.61	4.13	4.31	4.36	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	306/1520	4.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	546/1291	4.47	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	299/1483	4.53	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1417	3.33	3.55	4.08	4.14	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1405	3.96	3.91	4.12	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	233/1504	4.47	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	296/1519	4.92	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	306/1495	4.25	3.84	4.11	4.16	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	374/1459	4.51	4.25	4.47	4.52	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	544/1460	4.69	4.53	4.74	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	581/1455	4.27	3.96	4.32	4.39	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	257/1456	4.50	3.96	4.34	4.46	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	392/1316	4.23	3.79	4.03	4.18	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	876/1243	3.94	3.54	4.17	4.22	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	748/1241	3.97	3.64	4.33	4.38	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	781/1236	4.20	3.79	4.40	4.45	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 01
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	4.59	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 202 01	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 36
Title: Computer Science II		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 04
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	13	4.61	465/1520	4.61	4.13	4.31	4.36	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	360/1520	4.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	386/1291	4.47	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	243/1483	4.53	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1417	3.33	3.55	4.08	4.14	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	481/1405	3.96	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	182/1504	4.47	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	733/1519	4.92	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	780/1495	4.25	3.84	4.11	4.16	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	427/1459	4.51	4.25	4.47	4.52	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	962/1460	4.69	4.53	4.74	4.80	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	711/1455	4.27	3.96	4.32	4.39	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	631/1456	4.50	3.96	4.34	4.46	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	169/1316	4.23	3.79	4.03	4.18	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	840/1243	3.94	3.54	4.17	4.22	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	1090/1241	3.97	3.64	4.33	4.38	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	781/1236	4.20	3.79	4.40	4.45	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 04
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 07
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	7	9	4.00	1118/1520	4.61	4.13	4.31	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	6	4.00	1086/1520	4.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	8	4.13	902/1291	4.47	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	960/1483	4.53	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1253/1417	3.33	3.55	4.08	4.14	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1198/1405	3.96	3.91	4.12	4.13	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	4	11	4.00	999/1504	4.47	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	532/1519	4.92	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	9	11	2	3.68	1188/1495	4.25	3.84	4.11	4.16	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	11	7	3.96	1257/1459	4.51	4.25	4.47	4.52	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	1246/1460	4.69	4.53	4.74	4.80	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	11	5	3.83	1208/1455	4.27	3.96	4.32	4.39	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	8	10	4.09	1060/1456	4.50	3.96	4.34	4.46	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	3	7	6	4	3.55	1038/1316	4.23	3.79	4.03	4.18	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	753/1243	3.94	3.54	4.17	4.22	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	962/1241	3.97	3.64	4.33	4.38	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	989/1236	4.20	3.79	4.40	4.45	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	5	17	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 07
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 10
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	1/1520	4.61	4.13	4.31	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1520	4.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	442/1291	4.47	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1483	4.53	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	569/1504	4.47	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1519	4.92	4.72	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	262/1495	4.25	3.84	4.11	4.16	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202H 1
Title:	Computer Science II - Ho
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	0	16	4.47	651/1520	4.47	4.13	4.31	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	161/1520	4.84	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	255/1291	4.79	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	243/1483	4.73	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1417	4.80	3.55	4.08	4.14	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	283/1405	4.60	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	476/1504	4.47	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1495	5.00	3.84	4.11	4.16	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	119/1459	4.94	4.25	4.47	4.52	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.53	4.74	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	98/1455	4.94	3.96	4.32	4.39	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	553/1456	4.63	3.96	4.34	4.46	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	248/1316	4.59	3.79	4.03	4.18	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	552/1243	4.35	3.54	4.17	4.22	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	493/1241	4.59	3.64	4.33	4.38	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	598/1236	4.56	3.79	4.40	4.45	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	822/889	3.00	3.58	4.02	3.99	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202H 1
Title:	Computer Science II - Ho
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	83/164	4.20	4.20	4.15	4.57	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	50/165	4.53	4.53	4.19	4.40	4.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	50/160	4.71	4.71	4.45	4.74	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	77/158	4.53	4.53	4.36	4.63	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	6	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	59/150	4.33	4.33	4.05	4.59	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			0 P 0						
			0 I 0	Other	1				
			2 ? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 1
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	6	12	10	3.90	1218/1520	3.54	4.13	4.31	4.36	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	12	12	4.13	1005/1520	3.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	18	4.32	764/1291	3.85	4.20	4.33	4.44	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	6	3	11	4.14	917/1483	3.59	4.08	4.23	4.28	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	4	6	6	11	3.89	947/1417	3.52	3.55	4.08	4.14	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	3	2	2	8	4.00	843/1405	3.75	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	9	17	4.29	704/1504	4.10	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	672/1519	4.47	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	5	15	6	4.04	870/1495	3.23	3.84	4.11	4.16	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	13	14	4.29	1062/1459	3.84	4.25	4.47	4.52	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	27	4.77	864/1460	3.98	4.53	4.74	4.80	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	13	9	4.03	1060/1455	3.47	3.96	4.32	4.39	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	6	7	14	4.07	1068/1456	3.47	3.96	4.34	4.46	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	18	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	830/1316	3.30	3.79	4.03	4.18	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1243	2.89	3.54	4.17	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1241	2.97	3.64	4.33	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 1
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1236	3.32	3.79	4.40	4.45	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 2
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	9	7	6	3.31	1464/1520	3.54	4.13	4.31	4.36	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	11	7	8	3.62	1338/1520	3.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	8	10	3.79	1082/1291	3.85	4.20	4.33	4.44	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	5	5	5	5	3.50	1334/1483	3.59	4.08	4.23	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	5	5	4	7	3.20	1304/1417	3.52	3.55	4.08	4.14	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	3	8	2	5	3.37	1255/1405	3.75	3.91	4.12	4.13	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	8	16	4.28	726/1504	4.10	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	6	16	6	4.00	1435/1519	4.47	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	5	11	2	2	2.86	1449/1495	3.23	3.84	4.11	4.16	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	7	4	7	9	3.48	1389/1459	3.84	4.25	4.47	4.52	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	8	7	11	3.86	1425/1460	3.98	4.53	4.74	4.80	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	10	9	5	3.45	1335/1455	3.47	3.96	4.32	4.39	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	6	7	9	3.64	1272/1456	3.47	3.96	4.34	4.46	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	5	4	4	1	4	2.72	1263/1316	3.30	3.79	4.03	4.18	2.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	5	2	2	0	2	2.27	1235/1243	2.89	3.54	4.17	4.22	2.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	4	4	0	1	2	2.36	1232/1241	2.97	3.64	4.33	4.38	2.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1193/1236	3.32	3.79	4.40	4.45	3.18
4. Were special techniques successful	18	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 2
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.63	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 203 2	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 41
Title: Discrete Structures		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Stephens, Arthur		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0 A 16	Required for Majors	23 Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0 B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 4	General	1 Under-grad 29 Non-major 24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 3
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1372/1520	3.54	4.13	4.31	4.36	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	2	5	0	3.00	1472/1520	3.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1163/1291	3.85	4.20	4.33	4.44	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1391/1483	3.59	4.08	4.23	4.28	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1125/1417	3.52	3.55	4.08	4.14	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	759/1405	3.75	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1214/1504	4.10	4.12	4.16	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1519	4.47	4.72	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	2	4	0	2.82	1457/1495	3.23	3.84	4.11	4.16	2.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	2	4	3.83	1312/1459	3.84	4.25	4.47	4.52	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1420/1460	3.98	4.53	4.74	4.80	3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	3.17	1384/1455	3.47	3.96	4.32	4.39	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1426/1456	3.47	3.96	4.34	4.46	2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	6	2	2	3.36	1120/1316	3.30	3.79	4.03	4.18	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1132/1243	2.89	3.54	4.17	4.22	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1173/1241	2.97	3.64	4.33	4.38	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1181/1236	3.32	3.79	4.40	4.45	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 3
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.93	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 4
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	3	10	3	3.38	1444/1520	3.54	4.13	4.31	4.36	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	9	4	3.43	1398/1520	3.54	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	8	5	3.71	1116/1291	3.85	4.20	4.33	4.44	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1371/1483	3.59	4.08	4.23	4.28	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1237/1417	3.52	3.55	4.08	4.14	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1198/1405	3.75	3.91	4.12	4.13	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	9	9	4.10	924/1504	4.10	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	4.00	1435/1519	4.47	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	7	6	0	3.20	1384/1495	3.23	3.84	4.11	4.16	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	13	3	3.76	1334/1459	3.84	4.25	4.47	4.52	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	5	8	3	3.38	1453/1460	3.98	4.53	4.74	4.80	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	6	8	2	3.24	1372/1455	3.47	3.96	4.32	4.39	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	3	7	3.33	1353/1456	3.47	3.96	4.34	4.46	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	2	1	5	3	3.21	1169/1316	3.30	3.79	4.03	4.18	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1174/1243	2.89	3.54	4.17	4.22	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1178/1241	2.97	3.64	4.33	4.38	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1141/1236	3.32	3.79	4.40	4.45	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 4
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1 C 4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4 D 1						
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	1				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 304 1
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	3	10	12	11	3.51	1404/1520	3.51	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	4	12	19	4.00	1086/1520	4.00	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	8	27	4.46	606/1291	4.46	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	4	15	19	4.31	747/1483	4.31	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	3	5	8	11	3.89	939/1417	3.89	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	8	7	25	4.37	545/1405	4.37	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	4	6	22	3.95	1050/1504	3.95	4.12	4.16	4.15	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	2	9	13	7	3.81	1099/1495	3.81	3.84	4.11	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	7	14	16	4.05	1211/1459	4.05	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	5	32	4.70	1001/1460	4.70	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	8	14	15	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	4	7	8	17	3.75	1234/1456	3.75	3.96	4.34	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	19	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	841/1316	3.89	3.79	4.03	4.08	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	36	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 304 1
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 304 1
Title:	Social/Ethical Iss In IT
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 29 Required for Majors	Graduate 0	Major 35
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 5	D 0	Under-grad	43
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 5	Electives	0
**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
Other 0					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 1
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	212/1520	4.84	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	283/1520	4.67	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	423/1291	4.58	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	138/1483	4.79	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	4	0	4	9	5	3.50	1187/1417	3.62	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	190/1405	4.58	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	190/1504	4.83	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1519	4.95	4.72	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	224/1495	4.62	3.84	4.11	4.07	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	339/1459	4.88	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	570/1460	4.93	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	334/1455	4.74	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	328/1456	4.86	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	4	1	18	4.61	233/1316	4.62	3.79	4.03	4.08	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 1
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
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	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 313 2
Title:	Comp Organ & Assemb Lang
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	185/1520	4.84	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	18	4.61	443/1520	4.67	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	19	4.54	514/1291	4.58	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	253/1483	4.79	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	4	5	7	3.74	1052/1417	3.62	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	481/1405	4.58	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	84/1504	4.83	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	612/1519	4.95	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	270/1495	4.62	3.84	4.11	4.07	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	159/1459	4.88	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	218/1460	4.93	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	387/1455	4.74	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	160/1456	4.86	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	215/1316	4.62	3.79	4.03	4.08	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 313 2	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 34
Title: Comp Organ & Assemb Lang		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Frey,Dennis L		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 1
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Finin,Timothy W

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	93
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	8	6	8	20	14	3.46	1421/1520	3.46	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	10	8	16	18	3.61	1347/1520	3.61	4.04	4.27	4.26	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	11	11	27	4.00	974/1291	4.00	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	3	9	9	20	4.05	990/1483	4.05	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	7	8	14	9	12	3.22	1296/1417	3.22	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	3	3	8	15	15	3.82	1034/1405	3.82	3.91	4.12	4.13	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	4	10	11	25	3.80	1184/1504	3.80	4.12	4.16	4.15	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	3	51	4.86	693/1519	4.86	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	1	1	16	21	5	3.64	1225/1495	3.64	3.84	4.11	4.07	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	5	12	16	20	3.91	1284/1459	3.91	4.25	4.47	4.47	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	9	40	4.62	1108/1460	4.62	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	9	20	13	3.54	1310/1455	3.54	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	10	8	11	12	14	3.22	1379/1456	3.22	3.96	4.34	4.32	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	9	5	9	11	11	3.22	1166/1316	3.22	3.79	4.03	4.08	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	3	4	2	3	3.23	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	0	2	5	4	1	3.33	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	2	3	5	1	3.25	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	44	6	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 331 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 93
Title: Prin Of Prog Languages		Questionnaires: 56
Instructor: Finin,Timothy W		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	32	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	49
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	17	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 1
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	24	4.69	373/1520	4.64	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	333/1520	4.55	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	243/1291	4.71	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	564/1483	4.44	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	4	4	6	3.56	1163/1417	3.74	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	445/1405	4.53	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	4	20	4.45	516/1504	4.57	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	237/1519	4.97	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	279/1495	4.29	3.84	4.11	4.07	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	391/1459	4.59	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	648/1460	4.79	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	281/1455	4.50	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	384/1456	4.47	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	1	3	18	4.61	233/1316	4.32	3.79	4.03	4.08	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 1
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 1
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
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	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 2
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	18	4.70	360/1520	4.64	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	681/1520	4.55	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	255/1291	4.71	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	564/1483	4.44	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	3	1	3	8	3.88	955/1417	3.74	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	283/1405	4.53	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	282/1504	4.57	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1519	4.97	4.72	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	956/1495	4.29	3.84	4.11	4.07	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	1019/1459	4.59	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	942/1460	4.79	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	983/1455	4.50	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	12	9	4.26	936/1456	4.47	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	8	6	7	3.86	853/1316	4.32	3.79	4.03	4.08	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 2
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 3
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	12	18	4.55	555/1520	4.64	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	20	4.52	569/1520	4.55	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	7	22	4.55	504/1291	4.71	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	2	5	16	4.40	636/1483	4.44	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	4	2	10	3.80	1010/1417	3.74	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	2	1	15	4.53	364/1405	4.53	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	321/1504	4.57	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	414/1519	4.97	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	0	12	11	4.33	568/1495	4.29	3.84	4.11	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	21	4.63	664/1459	4.59	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	884/1460	4.79	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	603/1455	4.50	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	6	20	4.40	788/1456	4.47	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	338/1316	4.32	3.79	4.03	4.08	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 3
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	28	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	26
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 2	C 9	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341H 1
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	212/1520	4.82	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	306/1520	4.71	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	213/1291	4.82	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	171/1483	4.80	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	202/1417	4.69	3.55	4.08	4.07	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	235/1405	4.67	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	182/1504	4.76	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	632/1519	4.88	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1495	5.00	3.84	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	234/1459	4.88	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.53	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1455	5.00	3.96	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1456	5.00	3.96	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	90/1316	4.88	3.79	4.03	4.08	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341H 1
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 1
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Grasso,Michael

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	8	4	3.50	1409/1520	4.03	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	9	4.04	1060/1520	4.10	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	10	4.13	909/1291	4.12	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	7	3.96	1067/1483	4.28	4.08	4.23	4.25	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	3	4	3	5	3.11	1329/1417	3.49	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	6	6	3.33	1266/1405	3.85	3.91	4.12	4.13	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	9	10	4.04	965/1504	4.34	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	20	3	4.04	1423/1519	4.30	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	9	13	1	3.58	1255/1495	3.67	3.84	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	6	9	5	3.68	1356/1459	3.90	4.25	4.47	4.47	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	7	8	6	3.86	1425/1460	4.13	4.53	4.74	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	5	9	4	3.59	1294/1455	3.80	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	8	7	3	3.32	1357/1456	3.70	3.96	4.34	4.32	3.32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 345 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 29
Title: Software Design/Develop		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Grasso,Michael		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	3	7	4	3	3.41	1101/1316	3.71	3.79	4.03	4.08	3.41

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	0
84-150	7	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	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 2
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Wilson,Michael

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	16	4.56	530/1520	4.03	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	10	4.16	972/1520	4.10	4.04	4.27	4.26	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	909/1291	4.12	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	399/1483	4.28	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	8	2	6	3.88	955/1417	3.49	3.55	4.08	4.07	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	545/1405	3.85	3.91	4.12	4.13	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	291/1504	4.34	4.12	4.16	4.15	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	14	4.56	1066/1519	4.30	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	15	0	3.75	1136/1495	3.67	3.84	4.11	4.07	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	9	9	4.13	1180/1459	3.90	4.25	4.47	4.47	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	1273/1460	4.13	4.53	4.74	4.72	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	7	10	4.00	1075/1455	3.80	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	1060/1456	3.70	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	5	6	9	4.00	729/1316	3.71	3.79	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 2
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Wilson,Michael

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	3.98	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.91	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 2
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Wilson,Michael

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 1
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	0	3	9	5	3.79	1287/1520	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.44	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	772/1520	4.29	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	0	15	4.53	525/1291	4.30	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	906/1483	4.04	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1052/1417	3.42	3.55	4.08	4.12	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	646/1405	4.13	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	165/1504	4.43	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	6	4	3	3.77	1129/1495	3.78	3.84	4.11	4.21	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	664/1459	4.57	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	326/1460	4.76	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	4	12	4.37	807/1455	4.11	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	2	11	4.11	1052/1456	3.91	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	619/1316	3.92	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 411 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 21
Title: Computer Architecture		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Squire,Jon S		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 2
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Squire,Jon S

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1118/1520	3.89	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	930/1520	4.29	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	939/1291	4.30	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1101/1483	4.04	4.08	4.23	4.33	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1329/1417	3.42	3.55	4.08	4.12	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	843/1405	4.13	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	940/1504	4.43	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1114/1495	3.78	3.84	4.11	4.21	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	833/1459	4.57	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1142/1460	4.76	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1191/1455	4.11	3.96	4.32	4.37	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1248/1456	3.91	3.96	4.34	4.41	3.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 411 2	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 40
Title: Computer Architecture		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Squire,Jon S		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	987/1316	3.92	3.79	4.03	4.12	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 1
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Yesha,Yelena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	12	12	4.10	1058/1520	4.10	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	11	5	10	3.70	1302/1520	3.70	4.04	4.27	4.32	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	19	4.50	546/1291	4.50	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	8	6	9	3.80	1183/1483	3.80	4.08	4.23	4.33	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	10	4	14	4.07	767/1417	4.07	3.55	4.08	4.12	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	8	8	7	3.96	902/1405	3.96	3.91	4.12	4.25	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	529/1504	4.43	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	237/1519	4.97	4.72	4.70	4.70	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	7	15	5	0	2.93	1437/1495	2.93	3.84	4.11	4.21	2.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	9	8	8	3.75	1337/1459	3.75	4.25	4.47	4.54	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	10	10	6	3.71	1439/1460	3.71	4.53	4.74	4.78	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	14	5	3	3.19	1380/1455	3.19	3.96	4.32	4.37	3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	3	11	3	4	2.85	1422/1456	2.85	3.96	4.34	4.41	2.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	6	7	6	3	3	2.60	1274/1316	2.60	3.79	4.03	4.12	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 1
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Yesha,Yelena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 1
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Yesha,Yelena

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	3.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
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	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 435 1
Title:	Computer Graphics
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	18	4.82	221/1520	4.82	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	555/1520	4.52	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	414/1291	4.64	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	474/1483	4.52	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	880/1417	3.95	3.55	4.08	4.12	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	545/1405	4.36	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	394/1504	4.55	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	390/1495	4.48	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	616/1459	4.67	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.53	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	558/1455	4.57	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	631/1456	4.55	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	256/1316	4.57	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 435 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 47
Title: Computer Graphics		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Olano,Thomas M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	3	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 436H 1
Title:	Data Visualization Honor
Instructor:	Rheingans,Penny

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	7	7	3.77	1292/1520	3.77	4.13	4.31	4.44	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	12	3	3.81	1247/1520	3.81	4.04	4.27	4.32	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1291	****	4.20	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	5	5	8	3.86	1153/1483	3.86	4.08	4.23	4.33	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	4	12	4.00	803/1417	4.00	3.55	4.08	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	11	5	3.82	1034/1405	3.82	3.91	4.12	4.25	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	9	7	4	3.55	1307/1504	3.55	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	684/1495	4.24	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	940/1459	4.43	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	272/1460	4.95	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	761/1455	4.41	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	7	6	3.68	1258/1456	3.68	3.96	4.34	4.41	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	1	7	10	4.25	538/1316	4.25	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	876/1243	3.86	3.54	4.17	4.42	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1117/1241	3.57	3.64	4.33	4.56	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	815/1236	4.29	3.79	4.40	4.64	4.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 436H 1
Title:	Data Visualization Honor
Instructor:	Rheingans,Penny

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	6	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 1
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Kargupta,Hillol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	607/1520	4.67	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	360/1520	4.42	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	462/1291	4.32	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	831/1483	4.22	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1118/1417	3.71	3.55	4.08	4.12	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	687/1405	4.25	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	555/1504	4.01	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	852/1519	4.88	4.72	4.70	4.70	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	532/1495	4.53	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	736/1459	4.67	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	903/1460	4.85	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	748/1455	4.41	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	866/1456	4.55	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1120/1316	3.68	3.79	4.03	4.12	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 1
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Kargupta,Hillol

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 2
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	16	4.83	203/1520	4.67	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	972/1520	4.42	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	949/1291	4.32	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	842/1483	4.22	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1028/1417	3.71	3.55	4.08	4.12	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	635/1405	4.25	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	7	3	3.61	1287/1504	4.01	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1519	4.88	4.72	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	187/1495	4.53	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	445/1459	4.67	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	326/1460	4.85	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	748/1455	4.41	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	370/1456	4.55	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	729/1316	3.68	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 441 2	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 21
Title: Algorithms		Questionnaires: 18
Instructor: Kalpakis,Konsta		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 442 1
Title:	Info & Coding Theory
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	5	18	4.39	766/1520	4.39	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	20	4.56	513/1520	4.56	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	290/1291	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	212/1483	4.76	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	5	5	11	4.14	717/1417	4.14	3.55	4.08	4.12	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	155/1405	4.78	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	0	24	4.78	173/1504	4.78	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	956/1519	4.67	4.72	4.70	4.70	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	12	13	4.37	520/1495	4.37	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	23	4.75	903/1460	4.75	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	8	18	4.54	603/1455	4.54	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	20	4.50	683/1456	4.50	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 442 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 35
Title: Info & Coding Theory		Questionnaires: 29
Instructor: Lomonaco JR,Sam		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	26	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		Under-grad 27
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	13
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 451 1
Title:	Automata Thry& Form Lang
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	185/1520	4.86	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	485/1520	4.57	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	337/1291	4.71	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1483	4.60	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1097/1417	3.67	3.55	4.08	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	3.91	4.12	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1504	4.86	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	457/1495	4.43	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.25	4.47	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.53	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	215/1455	4.86	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	439/1456	4.71	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 451 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 11
Title: Automata Thry& Form Lang		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Chang,Richard		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 455 1
Title:	Numerical Computations
Instructor:	Stephens,Arthur

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	3	0	1	2.75	1505/1520	2.75	4.13	4.31	4.44	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1497/1520	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.32	2.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1151/1291	3.63	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1010/1483	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1407/1417	2.20	3.55	4.08	4.12	2.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1384/1405	2.50	3.91	4.12	4.25	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	0	3	3.00	1432/1504	3.00	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	1518/1519	3.29	4.72	4.70	4.70	3.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	2.88	1447/1495	2.88	3.84	4.11	4.21	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	1415/1459	3.29	4.25	4.47	4.54	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1326/1460	4.29	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	1	0	1	2.67	1439/1455	2.67	3.96	4.32	4.37	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1436/1456	2.71	3.96	4.34	4.41	2.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 455 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 18
Title: Numerical Computations		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Stephens,Arthur		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1184/1316	3.17	3.79	4.03	4.12	3.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 461 1
Title:	Database Mangmt Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	11	13	4.13	1033/1520	4.13	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	7	10	10	3.97	1127/1520	3.97	4.04	4.27	4.32	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	11	8	10	3.87	1051/1291	3.87	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	3	11	9	4.17	895/1483	4.17	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1058/1417	3.73	3.55	4.08	4.12	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	7	8	7	3.83	1018/1405	3.83	3.91	4.12	4.25	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	6	11	10	4.00	999/1504	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	28	4.86	672/1519	4.86	4.72	4.70	4.70	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	3	7	17	4.31	592/1495	4.31	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	712/1459	4.61	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	675/1460	4.86	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	4	7	14	4.22	946/1455	4.22	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	3	3	19	4.36	844/1456	4.36	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	698/1316	4.05	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 461 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 48
Title: Database Mangmt Systems		Questionnaires: 31
Instructor: Kalpakis,Konsta		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	5
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 471 1
Title:	Artificial Intelligence
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	24	4.74	300/1520	4.74	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	429/1520	4.61	4.04	4.27	4.32	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	204/1291	4.84	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	669/1483	4.38	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	10	13	4.00	803/1417	4.00	3.55	4.08	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	8	16	4.30	605/1405	4.30	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	262/1504	4.68	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	20	4.65	978/1519	4.65	4.72	4.70	4.70	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	152/1495	4.77	3.84	4.11	4.21	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	28	4.84	321/1459	4.84	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.53	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	592/1455	4.55	3.96	4.32	4.37	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	599/1456	4.58	3.96	4.34	4.41	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	508/1316	4.28	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 471 1
Title:	Artificial Intelligence
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	48
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	6
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 475 1
Title:	Neural Networks
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	9	4.47	666/1520	4.47	4.13	4.31	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1158/1520	3.93	4.04	4.27	4.32	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	756/1291	4.33	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	286/1483	4.69	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	692/1417	4.17	3.55	4.08	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	385/1405	4.50	3.91	4.12	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1080/1504	3.93	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1129/1519	4.50	4.72	4.70	4.70	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1361/1495	3.30	3.84	4.11	4.21	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	967/1459	4.40	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	1120/1460	4.60	4.53	4.74	4.78	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1220/1455	3.80	3.96	4.32	4.37	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1265/1456	3.67	3.96	4.34	4.41	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	674/1316	4.09	3.79	4.03	4.12	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	1220/1243	2.67	3.54	4.17	4.42	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1021/1241	3.83	3.64	4.33	4.56	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	649/1236	4.50	3.79	4.40	4.64	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 475 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 29
Title: Neural Networks		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Peng, Yun		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	7	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 481 1
Title:	Computer Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	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	7	8	4	3.84	1253/1520	3.84	4.13	4.31	4.44	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	8	6	5	0	2.84	1499/1520	2.84	4.04	4.27	4.32	2.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	5	2	3.32	1236/1291	3.32	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1480/1483	2.43	4.08	4.23	4.33	2.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	4	1	1	1	1	2.25	1404/1417	2.25	3.55	4.08	4.12	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	3	2	2	0	2.44	1386/1405	2.44	3.91	4.12	4.25	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	9	2	3.47	1329/1504	3.47	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	4	4.16	1377/1519	4.16	4.72	4.70	4.70	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	5	10	2	0	2.82	1455/1495	2.82	3.84	4.11	4.21	2.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	1230/1459	4.00	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	11	4	3.89	1421/1460	3.89	4.53	4.74	4.78	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	7	4	3.58	1300/1455	3.58	3.96	4.32	4.37	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	3	5	4	3.21	1379/1456	3.21	3.96	4.34	4.41	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	3	5	2	3	3.38	1113/1316	3.38	3.79	4.03	4.12	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1243	****	3.54	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1241	****	3.64	4.33	4.56	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 481 1
Title:	Computer Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1236	****	3.79	4.40	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 1
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre
Instructor:	Phatak,Dhananja

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	3	4	2	5	3.31	1464/1520	3.31	4.13	4.31	4.39	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1429/1520	3.29	4.04	4.27	4.28	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	6	5	3	3.47	1191/1291	3.47	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	1	1	6	6	0	3.21	1419/1483	3.21	4.08	4.23	4.25	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	1	5	6	1	3.54	1172/1417	3.54	3.55	4.08	4.13	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	2	6	3	1	2.80	1365/1405	2.80	3.91	4.12	4.24	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	6	3	4	3.29	1391/1504	3.29	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	4	1	4	2	2	2.77	1463/1495	2.77	3.84	4.11	4.20	2.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	4	6	2	3	3.00	1437/1459	3.00	4.25	4.47	4.48	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	1450/1460	3.47	4.53	4.74	4.77	3.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	4	5	2	3	3.00	1400/1455	3.00	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	5	4	2	3.00	1402/1456	3.00	3.96	4.34	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	3	4	1	3	3.17	1184/1316	3.17	3.79	4.03	3.86	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	692/1243	4.17	3.54	4.17	4.23	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	922/1241	4.00	3.64	4.33	4.39	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	806/1236	4.31	3.79	4.40	4.47	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	822/889	3.00	3.58	4.02	4.06	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 611 1
Title:	Adv Computer Architectre
Instructor:	Phatak,Dhananja

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3 A 13	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	7	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 1
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Joshi,Anupam

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	681/1520	4.45	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	1	10	9	4.14	997/1520	4.14	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	10	9	4.18	865/1291	4.18	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	1	4	8	7	3.77	1198/1483	3.77	4.08	4.23	4.25	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	2	3	7	5	3.58	1153/1417	3.58	3.55	4.08	4.13	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	5	9	4	3.57	1161/1405	3.57	3.91	4.12	4.24	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	781/1504	4.23	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	0	9	8	4.28	638/1495	4.28	3.84	4.11	4.20	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	712/1459	4.61	4.25	4.47	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	648/1460	4.86	4.53	4.74	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	761/1455	4.41	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	641/1456	4.55	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	3	11	4	3.95	789/1316	3.95	3.79	4.03	3.86	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	596/1243	4.29	3.54	4.17	4.23	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	655/1241	4.41	3.64	4.33	4.39	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	632/1236	4.53	3.79	4.40	4.47	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	456/889	4.00	3.58	4.02	4.06	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 621 1
Title:	Adv Operating Systems
Instructor:	Joshi,Anupam

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	3.66	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	21 Graduate 9 Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 16 Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	1 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 1
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1409/1520	3.50	4.13	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	2	6	3	3.64	1329/1520	3.64	4.04	4.27	4.28	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	844/1291	4.21	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	975/1483	4.07	4.08	4.23	4.25	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	803/1417	4.00	3.55	4.08	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1131/1405	3.64	3.91	4.12	4.24	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	489/1504	4.46	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	3	5	3	1	3.17	1393/1495	3.17	3.84	4.11	4.20	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	940/1459	4.43	4.25	4.47	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	1253/1460	4.43	4.53	4.74	4.77	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1365/1455	3.29	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	3	4	3.43	1333/1456	3.43	3.96	4.34	4.32	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	5	0	2	2	2	2.64	1271/1316	2.64	3.79	4.03	3.86	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	4	2	0	2.75	1215/1243	2.75	3.54	4.17	4.23	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	867/1241	4.13	3.64	4.33	4.39	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1024/1236	3.89	3.79	4.40	4.47	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.06	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 1
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	3.75	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	4.71	4.45	3.91	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	4.53	4.36	3.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 671 1
Title:	Prin Artificial Intell
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 677 1
Title:	Agent Arch/Multi-Agt Sys
Instructor:	Nirenburg,Serge

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	924/1520	4.25	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1472/1520	3.00	4.04	4.27	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1266/1291	3.00	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1411/1483	3.25	4.08	4.23	4.25	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1187/1417	3.50	3.55	4.08	4.13	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1071/1405	3.75	3.91	4.12	4.24	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1494/1504	2.00	4.12	4.16	4.21	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	852/1519	4.75	4.72	4.70	4.77	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1495	****	3.84	4.11	4.20	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1418/1459	3.25	4.25	4.47	4.48	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	903/1460	4.75	4.53	4.74	4.77	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1370/1455	3.25	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1432/1456	2.75	3.96	4.34	4.32	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	927/1316	3.75	3.79	4.03	3.86	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	405/1243	4.50	3.54	4.17	4.23	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1241	4.00	3.64	4.33	4.39	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	947/1236	4.00	3.79	4.40	4.47	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 677 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 5
Title: Agent Arch/Multi-Agt Sys		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Nirenburg,Serge		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	456/889	4.00	3.58	4.02	4.06	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 678 01
Title:	Intro Machine Learning
Instructor:	Miner,Donald

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	2	7	10	4.10	1064/1520	4.10	4.13	4.31	4.39	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	14	4	4.05	1060/1520	4.05	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1291	****	4.20	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	1067/1483	3.95	4.08	4.23	4.25	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1326/1417	3.11	3.55	4.08	4.13	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	716/1405	4.19	3.91	4.12	4.24	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	814/1504	4.19	4.12	4.16	4.21	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1382/1519	4.14	4.72	4.70	4.77	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	995/1495	3.92	3.84	4.11	4.20	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	5	10	3	3.62	1373/1459	3.62	4.25	4.47	4.48	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	981/1460	4.71	4.53	4.74	4.77	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	8	4	3.67	1274/1455	3.67	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	2	14	4.24	963/1456	4.24	3.96	4.34	4.32	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	7	1	1	3.20	1172/1316	3.20	3.79	4.03	3.86	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	5	8	4	3.83	886/1243	3.83	3.54	4.17	4.23	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	6	2	9	4.06	902/1241	4.06	3.64	4.33	4.39	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	781/1236	4.33	3.79	4.40	4.47	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/889	****	3.58	4.02	4.06	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 678 01
Title:	Intro Machine Learning
Instructor:	Miner,Donald

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/164	****	4.20	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/165	****	4.53	4.19	3.75	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/150	****	4.33	4.05	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 681 1
Title:	Advanced Comp Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	8	1	3.64	1352/1520	3.04	4.13	4.31	4.39	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1086/1520	3.17	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	929/1291	3.10	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1124/1483	3.25	4.08	4.23	4.25	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1010/1417	2.90	3.55	4.08	4.13	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1087/1405	3.16	3.91	4.12	4.24	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1175/1504	2.85	4.12	4.16	4.21	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1360/1519	4.03	4.72	4.70	4.77	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	1	0	5	0	3.00	1415/1495	2.50	3.84	4.11	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	1078/1459	3.64	4.25	4.47	4.48	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	779/1460	4.13	4.53	4.74	4.77	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1028/1455	3.05	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1212/1456	3.08	3.96	4.34	4.32	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1106/1316	2.76	3.79	4.03	3.86	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	2	3	3.40	1092/1243	2.39	3.54	4.17	4.23	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1158/1241	2.39	3.64	4.33	4.39	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1179/1236	2.46	3.79	4.40	4.47	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	709/889	3.50	3.58	4.02	4.06	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 681 1
Title:	Advanced Comp Networks
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 3 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	1 Under-grad 8 Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0 F 0	Electives	3
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0	Other	3
			2 ? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 681 2
Title:	
Instructor:	

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	7	1	0	1	2.44	1511/1520	3.04	4.13	4.31	4.39	2.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	0	2	1	2.33	1511/1520	3.17	4.04	4.27	4.28	2.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	0	0	2.11	1289/1291	3.10	4.20	4.33	4.38	2.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1475/1483	3.25	4.08	4.23	4.25	2.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	1	0	1	2.00	1409/1417	2.90	3.55	4.08	4.13	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1380/1405	3.16	3.91	4.12	4.24	2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	1	0	2	0	1.88	1497/1504	2.85	4.12	4.16	4.21	1.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1491/1519	4.03	4.72	4.70	4.77	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	0	2	1	0	2.00	1493/1495	2.50	3.84	4.11	4.20	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1437/1459	3.64	4.25	4.47	4.48	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1451/1460	4.13	4.53	4.74	4.77	3.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	2	1	0	2.00	1453/1455	3.05	3.96	4.32	4.31	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	1	0	2.33	1448/1456	3.08	3.96	4.34	4.32	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	4	2	1	2	0	2.11	1307/1316	2.76	3.79	4.03	3.86	2.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	1	0	0	1.38	1243/1243	2.39	3.54	4.17	4.23	1.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	1	1	0	0	1.38	1239/1241	2.39	3.64	4.33	4.39	1.38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 681 2
Title:	
Instructor:	

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	1	2	0	0	1.63	1235/1236	2.46	3.79	4.40	4.47	1.63

Frequency Distribution

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

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