

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0201  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 427  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	4	6	3.42	1560/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	2	8	3.72	1424/1666	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.30	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	1027/1406	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.31	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	1055/1615	4.43	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.83	3.72	4.07	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	4	3	2	3.15	1426/1528	3.83	4.22	4.12	4.00	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	4	8	3.83	1314/1650	4.33	4.30	4.22	4.28	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	405/1667	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1405/1626	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.07	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	4	4	7	3.82	1387/1559	4.34	4.45	4.46	4.47	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	2	4	8	4.00	1467/1560	4.50	4.73	4.72	4.68	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	3	3	7	3.59	1369/1549	4.16	4.24	4.31	4.32	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	3	7	3.65	1337/1546	4.18	4.25	4.32	4.32	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	1	3	6	3.40	1082/1323	3.95	4.15	4.00	3.91	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1049/1384	3.90	4.06	4.10	3.92	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1265/1378	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.09	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1378	4.28	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	850/ 904	2.83	3.94	4.03	3.94	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0201  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 427  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 428  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	338/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.23	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	323/1666	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	295/1406	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.31	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	254/1615	4.43	4.36	4.24	4.17	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	295/1566	3.83	3.72	4.07	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	421/1528	3.83	4.22	4.12	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	208/1650	4.33	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	270/1667	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	363/1626	4.01	4.11	4.11	4.07	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	355/1559	4.34	4.45	4.46	4.47	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1560	4.50	4.73	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	381/1549	4.16	4.24	4.31	4.32	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	22	4.70	470/1546	4.18	4.25	4.32	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	326/1323	3.95	4.15	4.00	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	740/1384	3.90	4.06	4.10	3.92	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	797/1378	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	840/1378	4.28	4.23	4.31	4.08	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/ 904	2.83	3.94	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301  
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 428  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	32	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	578/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	569/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	423/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	298/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	371/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	387/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	266/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	529/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	579/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	935/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1125/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	718/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	80/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	62/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 429  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 430  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	325/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	355/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	525/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	752/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	194/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	131/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	589/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	248/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	457/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	235/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	249/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	872/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	692/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 431  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	849/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	970/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1147/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 432  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	347/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1033/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1247/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1147/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	62/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0105  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 433  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1216/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	967/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	775/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1478/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1308/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	987/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	692/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	977/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 434  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	784/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	924/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	851/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	899/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	797/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1022/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	562/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	849/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1260/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1255/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 435  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	784/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	924/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	851/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	899/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	429/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	683/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1260/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1193/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1255/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 436  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1478/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1090/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	900/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1103/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1304/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	147/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	147/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	120/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	214/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0205  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 437  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	4.25	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0206  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I  
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 438  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1216/1670	4.62	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	870/1666	4.63	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1200/1566	4.03	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1274/1528	4.58	4.22	4.12	4.11	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	806/1650	4.73	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	953/1626	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.81	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.97	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	900/1549	4.56	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1329/1546	4.57	4.25	4.32	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	960/1323	4.35	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	820/1384	4.05	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	3.72	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	3.82	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	3.88	3.94	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	226/ 232	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	230/ 239	4.39	4.38	4.21	4.33	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	188/ 230	4.75	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	159/ 231	4.83	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 439  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1583/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1404/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1425/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	192/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 440  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1583/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1478/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1404/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	192/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 441  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1105/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	582/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	956/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	6	4.15	981/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	300/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	630/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	808/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	858/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	1222/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	936/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	835/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	6	5	4.00	692/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1247/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	1193/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1240/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	182/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	136/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	53/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	175/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	13				
				? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	401/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	352/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	176/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1108/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	670/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	572/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	410/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	231/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	519/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	70/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	95/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 442  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NA		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	401/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	344/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	352/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	176/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1108/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	519/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	70/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	95/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 443  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 444  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	665/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	622/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	387/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	687/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	570/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	877/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	276/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	451/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	423/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	95/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	147/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	120/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	100/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0301  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 445  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	835/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	477/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	566/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	509/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	2	2	0	2.86	1518/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	202/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	417/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	278/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	371/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	929/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	451/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	395/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	439/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	820/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	842/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	166/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	206/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	3.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	120/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	200/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	131/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	1	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		13				
				?	0							



Course-Section: CMSC 202 0301  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 446  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	835/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	477/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	566/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	509/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	2	2	0	2.86	1518/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	202/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	417/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	488/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	326/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	820/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	842/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	166/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	206/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	3.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	120/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	200/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	131/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	1	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		13				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0302  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 447  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	1094/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	233/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	948/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	874/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	851/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	899/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	272/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	403/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	387/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	777/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	366/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	971/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	384/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1103/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1092/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	751/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	199/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	105/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1	Under-grad 12 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	10	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0401  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 448  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	557/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	0	3.50	1508/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	924/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	552/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1453/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	631/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	844/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	953/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1256/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1054/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1104/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1032/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	567/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	777/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1110/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1189/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	557/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	0	3.50	1508/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	924/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	552/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1453/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	631/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	844/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	953/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	235/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	777/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1110/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1189/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0402  
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 450  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	4.45	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	876/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	4.47	4.36	4.24	4.29	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.23	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	899/1528	4.57	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.77	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1312/1626	4.23	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.82	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	900/1549	4.51	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.39	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	4.41	4.15	4.00	4.08	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	797/1378	4.31	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	813/1378	4.23	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	215/ 232	3.98	4.13	4.19	4.35	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	147/ 239	4.31	4.38	4.21	4.33	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	92/ 230	4.80	4.78	4.44	4.61	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	86/ 231	4.45	4.59	4.31	4.52	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	78/ 218	4.49	4.42	4.18	4.25	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 451  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	794/1670	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	1059/1666	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	306/1406	4.55	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	800/1615	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1285/1566	3.67	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	688/1528	4.29	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	316/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	405/1667	4.94	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	10	2	3.93	1089/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	933/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1042/1560	4.77	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	1044/1549	4.10	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	755/1546	4.43	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1082/1323	3.80	4.15	4.00	4.08	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	923/1378	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.94	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory															
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.52	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	14							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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		17				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 452  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	11	17	4.35	876/1670	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	13	4.19	1037/1666	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	11	18	4.48	620/1406	4.55	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	699/1615	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	3	8	8	4	3.36	1362/1566	3.67	3.72	4.07	4.00	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	0	10	12	4.39	570/1528	4.29	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	8	18	4.47	630/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	472/1667	4.94	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	13	8	4.08	915/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	6	23	4.70	623/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	855/1560	4.77	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	7	9	13	4.13	1078/1549	4.10	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	13	16	4.43	808/1546	4.43	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	692/1323	3.80	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1378	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	****/1378	4.38	4.23	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 904	4.00	3.94	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General		0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	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		28				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0301  
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 453  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	809/1670	4.39	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1161/1666	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	715/1406	4.55	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	687/1615	4.37	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	743/1566	3.67	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	760/1528	4.29	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	1135/1650	4.39	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.94	4.79	4.67	4.64	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.00	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1092/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	855/1560	4.77	4.73	4.72	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1146/1549	4.10	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	849/1546	4.43	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	692/1323	3.80	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.00	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.07	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.25	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	4.38	4.23	4.31	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	12				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CMSC 291V 0101  
 Title TPCS IN ANIMATION & IM  
 Instructor: HIRSCH, KATHERI  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 454  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.26	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.31	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	621/1566	4.27	3.72	4.07	4.00	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	769/1528	4.18	4.22	4.12	4.11	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1095/1650	4.07	4.30	4.22	4.20	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	183/1626	4.79	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.79	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.25	4.32	4.30	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	107/1323	4.92	4.15	4.00	4.08	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.19	4.29	4.25	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	501/1378	4.70	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	3.94	4.03	4.01	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CMSC 304 0101  
 Title SOCIAL/ETHICAL ISS IN  
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 455  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	17	4.35	876/1670	4.35	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	22	4.52	608/1666	4.52	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	18	4.37	763/1406	4.37	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	21	4.48	579/1615	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	3	3	6	12	4.13	771/1566	4.13	3.72	4.07	4.04	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	8	18	4.35	611/1528	4.35	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	10	11	3.84	1314/1650	3.84	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	749/1667	4.87	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	4	9	9	4.09	910/1626	4.09	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	6	5	16	4.14	1237/1559	4.14	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	1004/1560	4.72	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	6	16	4.24	985/1549	4.24	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	20	4.45	795/1546	4.45	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	781/1323	3.93	4.15	4.00	3.99	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 21	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 28
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 31	Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 24		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 456  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	4	8	8	3.87	1372/1670	3.97	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	10	4.09	1148/1666	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	7	8	3.91	1123/1406	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.22	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	1	7	9	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	752/1566	3.68	3.72	4.07	4.04	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	580/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	3	6	3	6	3.40	1503/1650	3.80	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	749/1667	4.93	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1152/1626	3.88	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	7	7	3.86	1374/1559	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.40	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	1090/1560	4.60	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	3	5	6	4	3.24	1463/1549	3.78	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	5	6	6	3.67	1329/1546	3.89	4.25	4.32	4.24	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	936/1323	3.88	4.15	4.00	3.99	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1384	4.02	4.06	4.10	4.12	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.43	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.54	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	2.63	****

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 456  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0201  
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: NIRENBURG, SERG  
 Enrollment: 54  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 457  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	11	10	4.08	1178/1670	3.97	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	784/1666	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	483/1406	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1615	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.18	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	3	3	5	4	3.22	1419/1566	3.68	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.07	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	0	9	13	4.19	973/1650	3.80	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1667	4.93	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	8	12	5	3.88	1143/1626	3.88	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	17	4.62	755/1559	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	1222/1560	4.60	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	912/1549	3.78	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	9	12	4.12	1095/1546	3.89	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	6	3	10	4.05	674/1323	3.88	4.15	4.00	3.99	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	940/1384	4.02	4.06	4.10	4.12	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	970/1378	4.43	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	653/1378	4.54	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	25
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 458  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1344/1670	3.84	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1435/1666	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.18	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1131/1406	3.97	4.31	4.32	4.22	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1448/1615	3.68	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1440/1566	3.06	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1152/1528	3.72	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	429/1650	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.92	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1438/1626	3.32	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1280/1559	4.12	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	1248/1560	4.56	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1389/1549	3.61	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1313/1546	3.83	4.25	4.32	4.24	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	641/1323	4.08	4.15	4.00	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 459  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1609/1670	3.84	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	2	3.23	1579/1666	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.18	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1288/1406	3.97	4.31	4.32	4.22	3.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1472/1615	3.68	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	4	0	1	2.50	1537/1566	3.06	3.72	4.07	4.04	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1328/1528	3.72	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1309/1650	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	1	6	0	1	2.42	1601/1626	3.32	4.11	4.11	4.06	2.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1445/1559	4.12	4.45	4.46	4.40	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1222/1560	4.56	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	3	5	1	3.15	1476/1549	3.61	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	3	3	3.15	1460/1546	3.83	4.25	4.32	4.24	3.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	864/1323	4.08	4.15	4.00	3.99	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.12	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 1						
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	10				
				? 0						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301  
 Title DATA STRUCTURES  
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 460  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	722/1670	3.84	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	686/1666	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	566/1406	3.97	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	6	6	10	4.09	1039/1615	3.68	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	4	4	7	5	3.52	1274/1566	3.06	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	899/1528	3.72	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	7	14	4.21	950/1650	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	540/1667	4.92	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	12	10	4.15	854/1626	3.32	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	538/1559	4.12	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	1138/1560	4.56	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	1036/1549	3.61	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	570/1546	3.83	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	537/1323	4.08	4.15	4.00	3.99	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						



Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 461  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	611/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	556/1666	4.01	4.23	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	679/1406	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	2	13	4.35	750/1615	4.04	4.36	4.24	4.18	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	3	6	3	5	3.59	1241/1566	3.33	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	969/1528	3.73	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	660/1650	3.77	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	885/1667	4.62	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	499/1626	3.94	4.11	4.11	4.06	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	689/1559	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	1102/1560	4.57	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	658/1549	3.98	4.24	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	595/1546	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	299/1323	4.05	4.15	4.00	3.99	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	690/1384	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.12	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	481/1378	4.46	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	531/1378	4.46	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	138/ 904	4.53	3.94	4.03	4.03	4.78

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		20
			? 2			

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201  
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO  
 Instructor: VICK, SHON  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 462  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	8	7	3.65	1490/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	11	7	5	3.46	1522/1666	4.01	4.23	4.27	4.18	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1202/1406	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.22	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	5	9	3.73	1337/1615	4.04	4.36	4.24	4.18	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	6	3	2	3.07	1467/1566	3.33	3.72	4.07	4.04	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	7	6	6	3.50	1274/1528	3.73	4.22	4.12	4.07	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	2	5	6	5	3	3.10	1569/1650	3.77	4.30	4.22	4.12	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1206/1667	4.62	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	4	8	5	4	3.43	1427/1626	3.94	4.11	4.11	4.06	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	4	7	9	4	3.44	1473/1559	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.40	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	1263/1560	4.57	4.73	4.72	4.67	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	10	7	5	3.44	1414/1549	3.98	4.24	4.31	4.25	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	5	9	3.56	1364/1546	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.24	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	2	4	7	5	3.55	1015/1323	4.05	4.15	4.00	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	777/1384	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.12	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	860/1378	4.46	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	867/1378	4.46	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	356/ 904	4.53	3.94	4.03	4.03	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	26
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		1
			? 2		
				Other	24
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101  
 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 463  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	8	17	4.30	943/1670	4.03	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	22	4.60	490/1666	4.01	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	27	4.77	306/1406	4.13	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	552/1615	3.93	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	5	1	4	6	6	3.32	1381/1566	3.39	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	580/1528	3.83	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	229/1650	4.35	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	270/1667	4.80	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	762/1626	3.50	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	452/1559	4.02	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	26	4.83	803/1560	4.21	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	6	19	4.41	802/1549	3.96	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	6	18	4.32	929/1546	3.91	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	431/1323	3.97	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	1301/1384	2.60	4.06	4.10	4.32	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1067/1378	3.10	4.19	4.29	4.55	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	937/1378	3.40	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General		2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	16
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	10	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		24				
				?	0							

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201  
 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE  
 Instructor: CASALE, DAVID A  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 464  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1442/1670	4.03	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1539/1666	4.01	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1275/1406	4.13	4.31	4.32	4.48	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	6	2	2	3.36	1505/1615	3.93	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1316/1566	3.39	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	1394/1528	3.83	4.22	4.12	4.26	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	1278/1650	4.35	4.30	4.22	4.28	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1052/1667	4.80	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	5	2	0	2.78	1577/1626	3.50	4.11	4.11	4.28	2.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1499/1559	4.02	4.45	4.46	4.58	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1520/1560	4.21	4.73	4.72	4.80	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1389/1549	3.96	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1379/1546	3.91	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	1020/1323	3.97	4.15	4.00	4.10	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1352/1384	2.60	4.06	4.10	4.32	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1358/1378	3.10	4.19	4.29	4.55	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1340/1378	3.40	4.23	4.31	4.60	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.26	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: YESHA, YELENA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 465  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1518/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1508/1666	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	751/1406	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1405/1615	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	851/1566	4.04	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1274/1528	3.84	4.22	4.12	4.26	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1565/1650	3.79	4.30	4.22	4.28	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.47	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1517/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1461/1559	4.15	4.45	4.46	4.58	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1532/1560	4.21	4.73	4.72	4.80	3.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	1477/1549	3.97	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.94	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1005/1323	3.94	4.15	4.00	4.10	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1314/1384	3.44	4.06	4.10	4.32	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1193/1378	4.19	4.19	4.29	4.55	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1276/1378	4.06	4.23	4.31	4.60	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 466  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	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	23	4.88	224/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	428/1666	4.08	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	205/1406	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.58	467/1615	4.10	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	1	1	4	4.09	802/1566	4.04	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	3	4.17	778/1528	3.84	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.46	645/1650	3.79	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1395/1667	4.47	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	151/1626	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	435/1559	4.15	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1560	4.21	4.73	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	294/1549	3.97	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	253/1546	3.94	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	507/1323	3.94	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	777/1384	3.44	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1378	4.19	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.06	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	19	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201  
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS  
 Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM  
 Enrollment: 47  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 466  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	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	23				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CMSC 433 0101  
 Title SCRIPTING LANGUAGES  
 Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J  
 Enrollment: 56  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 467  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	21	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	503/1666	4.59	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	8	13	4.15	956/1406	4.15	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	434/1615	4.62	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	3	1	4	6	3.56	1252/1566	3.56	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	580/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	17	4.52	555/1650	4.52	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	270/1667	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	584/1626	4.38	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	371/1559	4.85	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	855/1560	4.81	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	598/1549	4.58	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	3	2	16	4.20	1032/1546	4.20	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	431/1323	4.39	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 12	Under-grad 27 Non-major 2
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 1		



Course-Section: CMSC 435 0101  
 Title COMPUTER GRAPHICS  
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 468  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	1037/1666	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	997/1406	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	687/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	4	4	3	3	3.06	1467/1566	3.06	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	662/1528	4.30	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	903/1650	4.25	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	786/1667	4.84	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	358/1560	4.95	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	939/1546	4.32	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	355/1323	4.47	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 6	General 9	Under-grad 20	Non-major 3
84-150	6	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 8		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101  
 Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR  
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 469  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1407/1670	3.82	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1142/1666	4.09	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1131/1406	3.91	4.31	4.32	4.48	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	910/1615	4.22	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	787/1528	4.17	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	879/1650	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	888/1626	4.11	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	0	7	4.09	1258/1559	4.09	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1214/1560	4.55	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1108/1549	4.09	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	949/1546	4.30	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	648/1323	4.11	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 11	Non-major 1
84-150	6	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 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101  
 Title ALGORITHMS  
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 470  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1516/1670	3.86	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1484/1666	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	799/1406	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1009/1615	4.17	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1039/1566	3.79	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	899/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1417/1650	4.10	4.30	4.22	4.28	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	861/1667	4.90	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	7	1	0	2.89	1563/1626	3.44	4.11	4.11	4.28	2.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	1157/1559	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1214/1560	4.74	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1332/1549	3.92	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1379/1546	3.96	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	3.57	4.15	4.00	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1378	4.83	4.19	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1378	4.83	4.23	4.31	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201  
 Title ALGORITHMS  
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 471  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1116/1670	3.86	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	846/1666	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	4	4.71	363/1406	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	910/1615	4.17	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1173/1566	3.79	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	221/1528	4.38	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	471/1650	4.10	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.90	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	953/1626	3.44	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	809/1559	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.74	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1070/1549	3.92	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	822/1546	3.96	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1005/1323	3.57	4.15	4.00	4.10	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		1	Under-grad	14	Non-major
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	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		12			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 443H 0101  
 Title CRYPTOLOGY  
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 472  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1048/1666	4.18	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	656/1406	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	633/1615	4.44	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	796/1566	4.09	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	823/1528	4.13	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	769/1650	4.36	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1275/1626	3.73	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	1004/1560	4.73	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1237/1549	3.91	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	949/1546	4.30	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1125/1323	3.25	4.15	4.00	4.10	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 444 0101  
 Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE  
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 473  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1486/1670	3.67	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1564/1666	3.33	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.30	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	637/1626	4.67	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1431/1559	3.67	4.45	4.46	4.58	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1329/1546	3.67	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.60	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.33	4.57	4.56	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	62/ 79	4.00	4.33	4.45	4.53	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	76/ 80	2.00	2.67	3.97	3.67	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 444 0101  
 Title INFORMATION ASSURANCE  
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 474  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1486/1670	3.67	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1564/1666	3.33	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.30	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.67	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.60	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.33	4.57	4.56	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	62/ 79	4.00	4.33	4.45	4.53	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	76/ 80	2.00	2.67	3.97	3.67	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101  
 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA  
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 475  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1017/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	582/1666	4.54	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	644/1406	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	687/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	734/1566	4.17	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	832/1528	4.11	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1650	4.92	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	910/1626	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	623/1559	4.69	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1054/1560	4.69	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	840/1549	4.38	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	679/1546	4.54	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	648/1323	4.11	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	712/1384	4.20	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	3.94	4.03	4.22	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	751/1666	4.42	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	8	15	4.38	739/1406	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1059/1566	3.85	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	870/1528	4.05	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	645/1650	4.46	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	5	16	3	3.92	1600/1667	3.92	4.79	4.67	4.73	3.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	693/1626	4.29	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	1082/1559	4.35	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	873/1560	4.79	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	4	13	4.17	1048/1546	4.17	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1384	4.22	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101  
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM  
 Instructor: ARMSTRONG, THOM  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 476  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	28	Non-major	5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101  
 Title COMPUTER NETWORKS  
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED  
 Enrollment: 49  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 477  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	9	13	4.22	1027/1670	4.22	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	6	10	3.93	1294/1666	3.93	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	12	7	3.85	1158/1406	3.85	4.31	4.32	4.48	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	9	6	7	3.68	1368/1615	3.68	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	5	8	6	3.86	1059/1566	3.86	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	876/1528	4.05	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	9	12	4.22	938/1650	4.22	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	8	13	3	3.79	1226/1626	3.79	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	871/1559	4.52	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	1078/1560	4.68	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	8	6	11	4.12	1087/1549	4.12	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	4	12	3.96	1176/1546	3.96	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	597/1323	4.18	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General		11	Under-grad	27	Non-major	2
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1							
				I	0	Other		12				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CMSC 484 0101  
 Title JAVA SERVER TECHNOLOGI  
 Instructor: TARR, ROBERT M  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 478  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	589/1670	4.57	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	525/1406	4.57	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1078/1566	3.83	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.71	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	307/1650	4.71	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1220/1626	3.80	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1071/1546	4.14	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	403/1323	4.43	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.06	4.10	4.32	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 486 0101  
 Title MOBILE RADIO COMM  
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 479  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	8	4.35	876/1670	4.35	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	767/1666	4.41	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	775/1406	4.35	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1362/1615	3.69	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1355/1566	3.38	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1164/1528	3.73	4.22	4.12	4.26	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	831/1650	4.31	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	12	2	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	8	7	0	3.47	1405/1626	3.47	4.11	4.11	4.28	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	1009/1559	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	929/1560	4.76	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	8	4	3.88	1251/1549	3.88	4.24	4.31	4.43	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	1002/1546	4.24	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.06	4.10	4.32	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	****	4.19	4.29	4.55	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 5	General 8	Under-grad 17	Non-major 16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 491A 0101  
 Title CELL PROCESSORS & APPL  
 Instructor: YESHA, YELENA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 480  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	687/1615	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1528	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	867/1650	4.29	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	809/1559	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1138/1560	4.63	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	598/1549	4.57	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	457/1546	4.71	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	626/1323	4.14	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	4.06	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.23	4.31	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101  
 Title SOCIAL WEB TECHNOLOGIE  
 Instructor: CHEN, LIK  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 481  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	350/1670	4.77	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	477/1666	4.62	4.23	4.27	4.35	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	****	4.31	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	339/1566	4.60	3.72	4.07	4.17	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.22	4.12	4.26	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	527/1650	4.54	4.30	4.22	4.28	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	605/1626	4.36	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	221/1559	4.92	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.92	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1549	4.85	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	185/1546	4.92	4.25	4.32	4.43	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	95/1323	4.92	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	3.94	4.03	4.22	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	6	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General		10	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	1							

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101  
 Title WEARABLE COMPUTING  
 Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 482  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	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	6	8	5	3.64	1498/1670	3.64	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	8	5	5	3.41	1543/1666	3.41	4.23	4.27	4.35	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	948/1406	4.17	4.31	4.32	4.48	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	2	1	7	5	3.65	1393/1615	3.65	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	5	4	5	2	3.25	1406/1566	3.25	3.72	4.07	4.17	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	9	5	1	2.86	1482/1528	2.86	4.22	4.12	4.26	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	13	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1445/1650	3.56	4.30	4.22	4.28	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	1256/1667	4.41	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	921/1626	4.06	4.11	4.11	4.28	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.45	4.46	4.58	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	725/1560	4.85	4.73	4.72	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	6	7	6	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.24	4.31	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	1194/1546	3.95	4.25	4.32	4.43	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	355/1323	4.47	4.15	4.00	4.10	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	638/1384	4.30	4.06	4.10	4.32	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.19	4.29	4.55	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.23	4.31	4.60	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	222/ 904	4.56	3.94	4.03	4.22	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.13	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	4.42	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****



Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101  
 Title WEARABLE COMPUTING  
 Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 482  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	22	Non-major	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 601 0101  
 Title RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS  
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 483  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1017/1670	4.23	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1081/1666	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.31	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	981/1615	4.15	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	808/1566	4.08	3.72	4.07	4.20	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	724/1528	4.23	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	1249/1650	3.92	4.30	4.22	4.30	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1134/1667	4.54	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1263/1559	4.08	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1340/1560	4.38	4.73	4.72	4.81	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	840/1549	4.38	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1113/1546	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	612/1323	4.17	4.15	4.00	4.03	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	721/1384	4.18	4.06	4.10	4.21	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	571/1378	4.55	4.19	4.29	4.42	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	627/1378	4.55	4.23	4.31	4.51	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.33	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.33	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	2.67	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.90	****

Course-Section: CMSC 601 0101  
 Title RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS  
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 483  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	8	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 628 0101  
 Title INTRO MOBILE COMPUT  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPIINDE  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 484  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1591/1670	3.30	4.26	4.31	4.46	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.31	4.32	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1276/1615	3.83	4.36	4.24	4.33	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	6	1	3.30	1385/1566	3.30	3.72	4.07	4.20	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	1494/1528	2.75	4.22	4.12	4.33	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	1613/1650	2.70	4.30	4.22	4.30	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1427/1626	3.43	4.11	4.11	4.20	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1518/1559	3.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	1493/1560	3.90	4.73	4.72	4.81	3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1489/1549	3.00	4.24	4.31	4.37	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1448/1546	3.22	4.25	4.32	4.40	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	871/1323	3.83	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1154/1384	3.38	4.06	4.10	4.21	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	4.19	4.29	4.42	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	1276/1378	3.25	4.23	4.31	4.51	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.94	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 635 0101  
 Title ADV COMP GRAPHICS  
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 485  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.26	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	3.72	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.22	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	4.30	4.22	4.30	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.11	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.24	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.15	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.06	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.19	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.23	4.31	4.51	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	226/ 232	3.00	4.13	4.19	4.30	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	4.38	4.21	4.53	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.33	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.33	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 80	4.00	2.67	3.97	4.32	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.65	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 38	4.00	4.00	4.19	4.58	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	33/ 38	4.00	4.00	4.62	4.65	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.59	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.59	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 16	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.60	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 27	4.00	4.00	4.54	4.67	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.90	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.92	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: CMSC 635 0101  
 Title ADV COMP GRAPHICS  
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 485  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	23	4.66	492/1670	4.66	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	14	15	4.38	821/1666	4.38	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	679/1406	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	898/1615	4.24	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	11	14	4.24	653/1566	4.24	3.72	4.07	4.20	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	383/1528	4.55	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	2	6	19	4.37	769/1650	4.37	4.30	4.22	4.30	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	395/1626	4.52	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	589/1559	4.72	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	751/1560	4.84	4.73	4.72	4.81	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	14	14	4.31	924/1549	4.31	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	17	4.41	849/1546	4.41	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	2	5	9	10	3.93	794/1323	3.93	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	5	7	8	3.95	876/1384	3.95	4.06	4.10	4.21	3.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	819/1378	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.42	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	702/1378	4.45	4.23	4.31	4.51	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.38	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.78	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.59	4.31	4.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.00	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.00	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.00	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 13
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	25
			? 1		

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





Course-Section: CMSC 661 0101  
 Title PRIN OF DATABASE SYS  
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 487  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	706/1566	4.20	3.72	4.07	4.20	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.22	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.30	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559	4.83	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.73	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1053/1549	4.17	4.24	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.25	4.32	4.40	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1057/1384	3.60	4.06	4.10	4.21	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.23	4.31	4.51	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 687 0101  
 Title INTRO NETWORK SECURITY  
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPIINDE  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 488  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1610/1670	3.14	4.26	4.31	4.46	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1638/1666	2.71	4.23	4.27	4.34	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1337/1406	3.14	4.31	4.32	4.36	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1524/1615	3.29	4.36	4.24	4.33	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1246/1566	3.57	3.72	4.07	4.20	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.22	4.12	4.33	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1562/1650	3.14	4.30	4.22	4.30	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1462/1626	3.33	4.11	4.11	4.20	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1518/1559	3.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1310/1560	4.43	4.73	4.72	4.81	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1372/1549	3.57	4.24	4.31	4.37	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1462/1546	3.14	4.25	4.32	4.40	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	4.15	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.06	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.19	4.29	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.23	4.31	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.00	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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