

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0101
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 418
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	772/1576	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	798/1576	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	357/1342	4.76	4.35	4.32	4.19	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	441/1520	4.55	4.24	4.25	4.09	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	798/1465	4.27	3.86	4.12	4.02	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	806/1434	4.33	4.09	4.14	3.94	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	434/1547	4.62	4.18	4.19	4.10	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.58	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	772/1554	4.36	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.76	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	1240/1493	4.75	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	821/1486	4.68	4.24	4.32	4.26	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	579/1489	4.72	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	258/1277	4.62	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	802/1279	4.07	3.90	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1169/1270	4.32	4.13	4.35	4.09	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	870/1269	4.31	4.11	4.35	4.09	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/ 878	4.17	3.49	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.20	4.21	4.20	4.15	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	541/1576	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	434/1576	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	215/1342	4.76	4.35	4.32	4.19	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	441/1520	4.55	4.24	4.25	4.09	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	13	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	571/1465	4.27	3.86	4.12	4.02	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	7	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	193/1434	4.33	4.09	4.14	3.94	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	207/1547	4.62	4.18	4.19	4.10	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	15	4	4.21	1353/1574	4.58	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	449/1554	4.36	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	638/1488	4.76	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	582/1493	4.75	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	298/1486	4.68	4.24	4.32	4.26	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	614/1489	4.72	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	250/1277	4.62	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	802/1279	4.07	3.90	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	696/1270	4.32	4.13	4.35	4.09	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	747/1269	4.31	4.11	4.35	4.09	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	415/ 878	4.17	3.49	4.05	3.91	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	4.20	4.21	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0201
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 419
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 420
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	27	4.81	235/1576	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	173/1576	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.18	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	179/1342	4.76	4.35	4.32	4.19	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	218/1520	4.55	4.24	4.25	4.09	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	159/1465	4.27	3.86	4.12	4.02	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	270/1434	4.33	4.09	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	28	4.81	179/1547	4.62	4.18	4.19	4.10	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	7	4.22	1353/1574	4.58	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	11	16	4.59	323/1554	4.36	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	173/1488	4.76	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1493	4.75	4.68	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	69/1486	4.68	4.24	4.32	4.26	4.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	194/1489	4.72	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	176/1277	4.62	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	649/1279	4.07	3.90	4.17	3.96	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	532/1270	4.32	4.13	4.35	4.09	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	620/1269	4.31	4.11	4.35	4.09	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	****/ 878	4.17	3.49	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.20	4.21	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	727/1576	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.11	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	476/1576	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	480/1342	4.76	4.35	4.32	4.19	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	837/1520	4.55	4.24	4.25	4.09	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	1067/1465	4.27	3.86	4.12	4.02	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1075/1434	4.33	4.09	4.14	3.94	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	5	12	4.30	784/1547	4.62	4.18	4.19	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	281/1574	4.58	4.65	4.64	4.59	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	10	6	4.17	805/1554	4.36	4.07	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	638/1488	4.76	4.43	4.47	4.41	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1089/1493	4.75	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	596/1486	4.68	4.24	4.32	4.26	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	336/1489	4.72	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	298/1277	4.62	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	802/1279	4.07	3.90	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.32	4.13	4.35	4.09	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	882/1269	4.31	4.11	4.35	4.09	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 878	4.17	3.49	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	175/ 379	4.20	4.21	4.20	4.15	4.20	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 20	Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 422
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	583/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	511/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1242/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	527/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1074/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	678/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	813/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	585/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	802/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1070/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	928/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	799/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 423
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	856/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	381/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	928/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1086/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	709/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	203/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 424
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	988/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	1067/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	531/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	291/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	469/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1025/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	924/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	981/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	1118/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	692/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	745/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1070/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1242/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	2.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	128/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 425
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	500/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	879/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1242/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	900/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	712/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1355/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1253/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1381/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	****	

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	3
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	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0105
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 426
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	511/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	647/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	398/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	924/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1110/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	678/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	309/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1135/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	928/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	799/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 427
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	378/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1169/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1163/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	165/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	128/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.96	4.72	4.78	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.72	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.92	4.64	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.66	4.61	4.80	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	180/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.48	4.74	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.71	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.69	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 427
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	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	4	Non-major	3
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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 428
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1169/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1163/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	165/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	128/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.96	4.72	4.78	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.72	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.92	4.64	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.66	4.61	4.80	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	180/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.48	4.74	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.71	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.69	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	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 4	Non-major 3
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	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	0			

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 429
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.13	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1169/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1163/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	165/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	128/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.96	4.72	4.78	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.72	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.92	4.64	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.66	4.61	4.80	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	180/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.48	4.74	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.71	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.69	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 429
 JUL 2, 2009
 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 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 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 4 Non-major 3
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		
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 430
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.13	
Lecture															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1169/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1163/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	165/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	128/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.96	4.72	4.78	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.72	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.92	4.64	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.66	4.61	4.80	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	180/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.48	4.74	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.71	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.69	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.64	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 430
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	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	4	Non-major	3
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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 431
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	835/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1186/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1180/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	233/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	2.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	238/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	2.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	165/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.00	

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0203
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 432
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	219/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	167/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	805/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	678/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	888/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	133/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	103/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	180/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0204
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 433
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	4.50	637/1576	4.81	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	392/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	500/1342	4.73	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	376/1520	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1208/1465	3.99	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	193/1434	4.04	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	755/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	911/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	871/1554	4.12	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	666/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	584/1486	4.54	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	754/1489	4.41	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	438/1277	4.21	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1014/1279	4.06	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	928/1270	3.68	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	928/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 878	2.56	3.49	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	61/ 234	4.30	4.11	4.23	4.44	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	77/ 240	4.23	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.90	4.82	4.51	4.65	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	90/ 232	4.16	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	99/ 379	4.37	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	5.00	4.96	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	5.00	4.92	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	5.00	4.66	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	6	0	2	3.50	209/ 375	3.92	3.32	4.01	4.21	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	207/ 326	3.59	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.29	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	7	1	1	3.33	250/ 382	4.13	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.33	

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0204
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 433
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: ANTHONY, ADAM P
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 434
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	5	4.71	347/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	910/1576	4.52	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1342	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	945/1520	4.38	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.35	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1547	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1262/1574	4.77	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	924/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	786/1488	4.77	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1270/1493	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	792/1486	4.65	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	934/1489	4.48	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	215/1277	4.22	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	962/1279	3.94	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270	3.98	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	3.99	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	4.00	3.49	4.05	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	209/ 234	3.77	4.11	4.23	4.44	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	226/ 240	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.47	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.62	4.82	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	206/ 232	3.97	4.09	4.29	4.38	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	362/ 379	4.16	4.21	4.20	4.29	3.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.38	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.42	4.08	4.39	****

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: ANTHONY, ADAM P
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 435
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	4	4.00	1148/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.52	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	770/1342	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.38	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.35	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	755/1547	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.77	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	924/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.77	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1384/1493	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	678/1486	4.65	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	888/1489	4.48	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1149/1277	4.22	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.94	3.90	4.17	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	3.98	4.13	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	3.99	4.11	4.35	4.29	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/ 379	4.16	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.50
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.21	3.32	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.38	3.30	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.42	4.08	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	415/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	568/1576	4.52	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	633/1342	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	385/1520	4.38	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.35	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.77	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	371/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	309/1488	4.77	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	658/1493	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	468/1486	4.65	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	579/1489	4.48	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	421/1277	4.22	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	3.94	3.90	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	3.98	4.13	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	3.99	4.11	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	195/ 234	3.77	4.11	4.23	4.44	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	77/ 240	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 229	4.62	4.82	4.51	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	123/ 232	3.97	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 379	4.16	4.21	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.21	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	164/ 326	3.38	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.75	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.42	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	0	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202
 Title: COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 437
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1023/1576	4.52	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1097/1342	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.41	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1232/1520	4.38	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.35	4.09	4.14	4.06	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1547	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	4.77	4.65	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.77	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1025/1486	4.65	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1222/1489	4.48	4.16	4.32	4.31	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	839/1277	4.22	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.94	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1208/1270	3.98	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1210/1269	3.99	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	3.77	4.11	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.62	4.82	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	3.97	4.09	4.29	4.38	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.21	3.32	4.01	4.21	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.19	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	637/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	279/1576	4.52	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	406/1342	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	464/1520	4.38	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	513/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	647/1434	4.35	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1547	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.77	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.05	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.77	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1486	4.65	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	461/1489	4.48	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1277	4.22	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	802/1279	3.94	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1181/1270	3.98	4.13	4.35	4.30	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1180/1269	3.99	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	4.00	3.49	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.77	4.11	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.62	4.82	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	3.97	4.09	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	4.16	4.21	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.21	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 326	3.38	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	269/ 382	3.19	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.25	

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	772/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	420/1576	4.52	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	620/1342	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1008/1520	4.38	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1166/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	878/1434	4.35	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	434/1547	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	508/1574	4.77	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	463/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	370/1488	4.77	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	191/1486	4.65	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	286/1489	4.48	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	394/1277	4.22	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1279	3.94	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	636/1270	3.98	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	773/1269	3.99	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	4.00	3.49	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	74/ 234	3.77	4.11	4.23	4.44	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	73/ 240	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 229	4.62	4.82	4.51	4.65	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	82/ 232	3.97	4.09	4.29	4.38	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	4	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	61/ 379	4.16	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.63	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.21	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.38	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.19	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
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	11				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	976/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	462/1576	4.52	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	797/1342	4.34	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	191/1520	4.38	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1421/1465	3.88	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1117/1434	4.35	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	592/1547	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.77	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1554	4.39	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	223/1488	4.77	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1486	4.65	4.24	4.32	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	364/1489	4.48	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	438/1277	4.22	3.95	4.03	4.01	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	689/1279	3.94	3.90	4.17	4.14	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	3.98	4.13	4.35	4.30	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	3.99	4.11	4.35	4.29	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.49	4.05	3.92	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	4	0	1	1	5	3.27	223/ 234	3.77	4.11	4.23	4.44	3.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	143/ 240	4.25	4.30	4.35	4.47	4.27	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	2	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	196/ 229	4.62	4.82	4.51	4.65	4.11	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	213/ 232	3.97	4.09	4.29	4.38	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	229/ 379	4.16	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	220/ 375	3.21	3.32	4.01	4.21	3.43	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	3.38	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.19	3.42	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 441
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	11	7	4.04	1124/1576	3.98	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	891/1576	4.20	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	761/1342	4.31	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	10	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.01	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1364/1465	3.41	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	670/1434	4.03	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	774/1547	4.27	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1574	4.80	4.65	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	2	10	4	3.83	1110/1554	3.67	4.07	4.10	4.05	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	9	13	4.43	957/1488	4.21	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	1159/1493	4.47	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	4.35	881/1486	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	777/1489	3.98	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1102/1277	3.23	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	2	4	2	3.08	1175/1279	3.08	3.90	4.17	4.14	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	0	2	2	2	2.64	1244/1270	2.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	2.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	1154/1269	3.36	4.11	4.35	4.29	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	3.49	4.05	3.92	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	128/ 379	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	250/ 382	3.31	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	23
			Other	22	Major
					Non-major
					15
					8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	13	14	4.32	871/1576	3.98	4.35	4.30	4.35	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	683/1576	4.20	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	393/1342	4.31	4.35	4.32	4.41	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	429/1520	4.01	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1130/1465	3.41	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	682/1434	4.03	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	9	18	4.45	608/1547	4.27	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	720/1574	4.80	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	518/1554	3.67	4.07	4.10	4.05	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	505/1488	4.21	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	582/1493	4.47	4.68	4.73	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	14	11	4.21	996/1486	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.29	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	637/1489	3.98	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.23	3.95	4.03	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1279	3.08	3.90	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1270	2.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	3.36	4.11	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 878	3.67	3.49	4.05	3.92	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.31	3.42	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 32 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 26	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	6	5	3.58	1420/1576	3.98	4.35	4.30	4.35	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	5	6	3.84	1270/1576	4.20	4.24	4.27	4.32	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	8	3.89	1072/1342	4.31	4.35	4.32	4.41	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1377/1520	4.01	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	0	4	7	3.39	1299/1465	3.41	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	1181/1434	4.03	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	4	10	4.05	1006/1547	4.27	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	957/1574	4.80	4.65	4.64	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	1	7	3	1	2.75	1506/1554	3.67	4.07	4.10	4.05	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	6	5	4	3.44	1398/1488	4.21	4.43	4.47	4.44	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	2	6	7	3.94	1429/1493	4.47	4.68	4.73	4.75	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	3	3	5	3.17	1400/1486	3.91	4.24	4.32	4.29	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	4	3	4	2.94	1430/1489	3.98	4.16	4.32	4.31	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	2	3	1	4	2.93	1185/1277	3.23	3.95	4.03	4.01	2.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1279	3.08	3.90	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1270	2.64	4.13	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1269	3.36	4.11	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	3.67	3.49	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.21	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.43	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	261/ 382	3.31	3.42	4.08	4.39	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 304 0101
 Title SOCIAL/ETHICAL ISS IN
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 444
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	10	9	3.82	1308/1576	3.82	4.35	4.30	4.30	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	10	12	4.04	1119/1576	4.04	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	18	4.36	753/1342	4.36	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	8	15	4.30	815/1520	4.30	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	0	3	5	8	3.79	1081/1465	3.79	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	7	16	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	6	5	13	3.89	1152/1547	3.89	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	5	21	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	2	2	5	10	8	3.74	1173/1554	3.74	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	7	5	10	3.67	1368/1488	3.67	4.43	4.47	4.47	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	5	4	8	9	3.70	1273/1486	3.70	4.24	4.32	4.32	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	5	12	3.85	1214/1489	3.85	4.16	4.32	4.34	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.95	4.03	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	745/1279	4.14	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1270	4.57	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	602/1269	4.57	4.11	4.35	4.41	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	218/ 379	4.06	4.21	4.20	4.17	4.06
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	14	0	1	3.13	273/ 375	3.13	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.13
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate 0 Major 19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	1	Under-grad 28 Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	21	
			? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA
 Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 445
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	4	1	8	2	3.53	1434/1576	3.72	4.35	4.30	4.30	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	0	8	2	0	2.57	1564/1576	3.19	4.24	4.27	4.28	2.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	6	3	0	2.67	1329/1342	3.49	4.35	4.32	4.30	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	3	3	2	1	2.58	1507/1520	3.21	4.24	4.25	4.25	2.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.78	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	4	2	4	2	3.15	1342/1434	3.60	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	1	7	0	2.86	1491/1547	3.70	4.18	4.19	4.21	2.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1003/1574	4.68	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	4	3	1	1	2.55	1522/1554	3.02	4.07	4.10	4.09	2.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1365/1488	3.78	4.43	4.47	4.47	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1460/1493	3.97	4.68	4.73	4.70	3.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	3	4	3.43	1355/1486	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.32	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	2	2	5	3.20	1392/1489	3.60	4.16	4.32	4.34	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	943/1277	3.52	3.95	4.03	4.11	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1221/1279	3.49	3.90	4.17	4.20	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1187/1270	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.42	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	1210/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.41	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	245/ 375	3.13	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.25	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.10	3.30	4.03	4.23	3.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	250/ 382	3.17	3.42	4.08	4.24	3.33	

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	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA
 Instructor: CASALE, DAVID A
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 446
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	1241/1576	3.72	4.35	4.30	4.30	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	7	6	3.82	1286/1576	3.19	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	788/1342	3.49	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1212/1520	3.21	4.24	4.25	4.25	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	818/1465	3.78	3.86	4.12	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	10	5	4.06	857/1434	3.60	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	480/1547	3.70	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	739/1574	4.68	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	4	4	7	3	3.50	1303/1554	3.02	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	6	8	7	3.87	1326/1488	3.78	4.43	4.47	4.47	3.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	9	11	4.26	1351/1493	3.97	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	8	5	3.64	1296/1486	3.53	4.24	4.32	4.32	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	9	8	4.00	1118/1489	3.60	4.16	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	2	5	7	3	3.37	1077/1277	3.52	3.95	4.03	4.11	3.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	745/1279	3.49	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	3.93	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	870/1269	3.58	4.11	4.35	4.41	4.17	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	16	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.13	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.30	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	10	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.17	3.42	4.08	4.24	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 23	Non-major 1
84-150	1	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 20		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES
 Instructor: VICK, SHON
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 447
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	8	3.83	1299/1576	3.71	4.35	4.30	4.30	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	8	3	3.38	1448/1576	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	3	10	3.67	1166/1342	4.08	4.35	4.32	4.30	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	4	5	10	3.95	1103/1520	3.95	4.24	4.25	4.25	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1423/1465	3.12	3.86	4.12	4.09	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	1366/1434	3.07	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	7	7	3.67	1276/1547	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	4	15	4	4.00	1459/1574	4.21	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	8	6	3	3.35	1362/1554	3.48	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	5	8	8	3.88	1324/1488	4.19	4.43	4.47	4.47	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	1176/1493	4.42	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	7	4	8	3	3.13	1409/1486	3.66	4.24	4.32	4.32	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	9	8	3.79	1239/1489	3.87	4.16	4.32	4.34	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	2	4	3	6	3.39	1071/1277	3.69	3.95	4.03	4.11	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.11	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	14	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.05	4.21	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	302/ 382	3.28	3.42	4.08	4.24	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	4	7	6	3.59	1413/1576	3.71	4.35	4.30	4.30	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	9	10	4.23	968/1576	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	583/1342	4.08	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1520	3.95	4.24	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	3	1	4	4	5	3.41	1287/1465	3.12	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1434	3.07	4.09	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	270/1547	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	1177/1574	4.21	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	5	9	2	3.61	1260/1554	3.48	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	870/1488	4.19	4.43	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	1337/1493	4.42	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	1003/1486	3.66	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	2	5	9	3.95	1155/1489	3.87	4.16	4.32	4.34	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	692/1277	3.69	3.95	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1279	3.67	3.90	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1270	4.67	4.13	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	4.67	4.11	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	210/ 379	4.05	4.21	4.20	4.17	4.09	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.67	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	7	0	2	3.44	228/ 382	3.28	3.42	4.08	4.24	3.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 23	Non-major 6
84-150	6	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 19		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: BERGERON, RYAN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 449
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	7	4.16	1050/1576	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.30	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	3	3.63	1356/1576	4.10	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	955/1342	4.36	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	8	3	3.47	1373/1520	3.88	4.24	4.25	4.25	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1386/1465	3.28	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1004/1434	3.91	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	10	2	3.58	1316/1547	4.09	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1574	4.86	4.65	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	1214/1554	3.93	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	1203/1488	4.40	4.43	4.47	4.47	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	11	7	4.26	1351/1493	4.56	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	11	3	3.74	1261/1486	4.04	4.24	4.32	4.32	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	11	5	3.89	1196/1489	4.21	4.16	4.32	4.34	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	692/1277	4.01	3.95	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	926/1279	3.98	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	928/1269	4.19	4.11	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	265/ 375	3.08	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.17	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.50	3.42	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1
				P	1
				I	1
				?	1
			Required for Majors		1
			General		0
			Electives		0
			Other		17
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			Graduate	0	Major
			Under-grad	19	Non-major
					4

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: PENG, YUN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 450
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	5	4.15	1050/1576	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.30	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	1217/1576	4.10	4.24	4.27	4.28	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	726/1342	4.36	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	8	2	3.77	1251/1520	3.88	4.24	4.25	4.25	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1360/1465	3.28	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1305/1434	3.91	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	708/1547	4.09	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	586/1574	4.86	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	7	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.93	4.07	4.10	4.09	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1010/1488	4.40	4.43	4.47	4.47	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1240/1493	4.56	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	9	3	4.08	1078/1486	4.04	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1080/1489	4.21	4.16	4.32	4.34	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	839/1277	4.01	3.95	4.03	4.11	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/1279	3.98	3.90	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1270	4.50	4.13	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1269	4.19	4.11	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.08	3.32	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.42	4.08	4.24	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 451
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	227/1576	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.30	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	301/1576	4.10	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	418/1342	4.36	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	665/1520	3.88	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	3	0	2	6	6	3.71	1138/1465	3.28	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	368/1434	3.91	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	2	14	4.30	784/1547	4.09	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	795/1574	4.86	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	477/1554	3.93	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	19	4.70	624/1488	4.40	4.43	4.47	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	279/1493	4.56	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	922/1486	4.04	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	513/1489	4.21	4.16	4.32	4.34	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	6	0	12	4.21	569/1277	4.01	3.95	4.03	4.11	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	758/1279	3.98	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	747/1269	4.19	4.11	4.35	4.41	4.38	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.08	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.50	3.42	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	20
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 452
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	8	12	4.00	1148/1576	4.05	4.35	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	16	4.32	864/1576	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	788/1342	4.58	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	648/1520	4.62	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	1	5	8	7	3.33	1317/1465	3.40	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	6	14	4.19	758/1434	4.15	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	7	5	12	4.12	955/1547	4.40	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	645/1574	4.69	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	12	6	4.00	924/1554	4.13	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	1048/1488	4.39	4.43	4.47	4.47	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	1053/1493	4.64	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	14	4.41	821/1486	4.51	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	10	10	3.96	1147/1489	4.34	4.16	4.32	4.34	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	9	4	10	3.88	812/1277	4.01	3.95	4.03	4.11	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1000/1279	4.00	3.90	4.17	4.20	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	696/1270	4.47	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	6	3	9	4.17	870/1269	4.33	4.11	4.35	4.41	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	631/ 878	4.18	3.49	4.05	4.09	3.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	20	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.17	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	13	0	1	3.14	270/ 375	3.14	3.32	4.01	4.12	3.14	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.23	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	12	1	4	3.53	216/ 382	3.53	3.42	4.08	4.24	3.53	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	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	27				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: GRASSO, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 453
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	1089/1576	4.05	4.35	4.30	4.30	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	434/1576	4.48	4.24	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	215/1342	4.58	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	185/1520	4.62	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	0	4	3	5	3.47	1262/1465	3.40	3.86	4.12	4.09	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	826/1434	4.15	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	315/1547	4.40	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	0	2	14	4.56	1041/1574	4.69	4.65	4.64	4.61	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	702/1554	4.13	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	945/1488	4.39	4.43	4.47	4.47	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1113/1493	4.64	4.68	4.73	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	545/1486	4.51	4.24	4.32	4.32	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	420/1489	4.34	4.16	4.32	4.34	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	623/1277	4.01	3.95	4.03	4.11	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	603/1279	4.00	3.90	4.17	4.20	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	636/1270	4.47	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1269	4.33	4.11	4.35	4.41	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	187/ 878	4.18	3.49	4.05	4.09	4.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.23	****	

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	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 454
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	3	4	8	3.74	1353/1576	3.82	4.35	4.30	4.46	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	364/1576	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	263/1342	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	511/1520	4.32	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	708/1465	3.60	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	2	0	4	6	3.71	1117/1434	3.92	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	315/1547	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1574	4.94	4.65	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	892/1554	4.22	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	278/1488	4.84	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	868/1493	4.89	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	763/1486	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	3	0	13	4.41	801/1489	4.61	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	551/1277	4.07	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1129/1279	3.07	3.90	4.17	4.31	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1135/1270	3.45	4.13	4.35	4.53	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1010/1269	3.92	4.11	4.35	4.55	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.20	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201
 Title: COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 455
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1241/1576	3.82	4.35	4.30	4.46	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	759/1576	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	709/1342	4.59	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	961/1520	4.32	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1386/1465	3.60	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	816/1434	3.92	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	339/1547	4.68	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.94	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	571/1554	4.22	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	401/1488	4.84	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	4.89	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	561/1486	4.52	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	309/1489	4.61	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	802/1277	4.07	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1224/1279	3.07	3.90	4.17	4.31	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1156/1270	3.45	4.13	4.35	4.53	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	928/1269	3.92	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	3.20	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: YESHA, YELENA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 456
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1410/1576	3.74	4.35	4.30	4.46	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	3	2	3.07	1518/1576	3.06	4.24	4.27	4.35	3.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	3	1	2.53	1337/1342	2.59	4.35	4.32	4.46	2.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	3	4	1	2.93	1484/1520	3.15	4.24	4.25	4.38	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	5	2	2	2.92	1410/1465	3.18	3.86	4.12	4.22	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	6	2	2	3.07	1366/1434	3.11	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	4	1	1	3	2.50	1516/1547	3.01	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	665/1574	4.40	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	3	7	2	0	2.64	1515/1554	3.07	4.07	4.10	4.24	2.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	10	2	3	3.53	1384/1488	3.80	4.43	4.47	4.55	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	1456/1493	4.09	4.68	4.73	4.80	3.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	7	1	3	3.13	1407/1486	3.30	4.24	4.32	4.41	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	6	2	1	1	2.21	1477/1489	2.89	4.16	4.32	4.38	2.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	3	3	1	1	2.60	1230/1277	2.95	3.95	4.03	4.04	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1262/1279	2.40	3.90	4.17	4.31	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	3.20	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	1257/1576	3.74	4.35	4.30	4.46	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	7	0	3.06	1519/1576	3.06	4.24	4.27	4.35	3.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	6	4	0	2.65	1330/1342	2.59	4.35	4.32	4.46	2.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	5	3	5	3	3.38	1408/1520	3.15	4.24	4.25	4.38	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	2	5	3	3.43	1282/1465	3.18	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1342/1434	3.11	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1338/1547	3.01	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	15	1	4.00	1459/1574	4.40	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	7	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.07	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1215/1488	3.80	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	1263/1493	4.09	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	3	5	3	3.47	1342/1486	3.30	4.24	4.32	4.41	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1304/1489	2.89	4.16	4.32	4.38	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	4	1	4	3	3.31	1095/1277	2.95	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1279	2.40	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1270	3.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	4.60	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.20	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.20	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

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	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	4	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	16				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	34	4.85	211/1576	4.85	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	30	4.64	420/1576	4.64	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	10	24	4.47	620/1342	4.47	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	270/1520	4.74	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	513/1465	4.40	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	184/1434	4.76	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	160/1547	4.84	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	12	22	4.57	339/1554	4.57	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	149/1488	4.94	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	33	4.91	501/1493	4.91	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	7	26	4.68	453/1486	4.68	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	0	8	23	4.47	731/1489	4.47	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	123/1277	4.84	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1279	****	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	35	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	18	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	14	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 34
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12	General	25 Under-grad 39 Non-major 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 7		
84-150	20	3.00-3.49 9	D 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	12

Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101
 Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 459
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1291/1576	3.85	4.35	4.30	4.46	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	462/1576	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	286/1342	4.77	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	731/1520	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	228/1547	4.77	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	518/1554	4.42	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	339/1488	4.85	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	231/1486	4.85	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	921/1489	4.31	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	250/1277	4.62	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	3.90	4.17	4.31	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 13	Non-major 1
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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101
 Title ALGORITHMS
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 460
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	23	4.60	500/1576	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	324/1576	4.49	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	357/1342	4.35	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	707/1520	4.19	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	3	2	8	5	9	3.56	1225/1465	3.68	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	564/1434	4.03	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	280/1547	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1574	4.95	4.65	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	180/1554	4.48	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	27	4.87	293/1488	4.82	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	390/1493	4.90	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	11	18	4.52	666/1486	4.44	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	5	24	4.68	487/1489	4.54	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	551/1277	3.68	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/1279	****	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	3.18	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1	Major 32
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 35	Non-major 4
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	16	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 31		
				? 3			

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201
 Title ALGORITHMS
 Instructor: COLE, FLOYD
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 461
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	582/1576	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	920/1576	4.49	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	11	4.00	972/1342	4.35	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	2	0	5	10	4.00	1041/1520	4.19	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	1067/1465	3.68	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	3	0	1	3	6	3.69	1127/1434	4.03	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	0	4	11	3.90	1145/1547	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	469/1574	4.95	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	772/1554	4.48	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	463/1488	4.82	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	658/1493	4.90	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	6	13	4.36	861/1486	4.44	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	15	4.41	813/1489	4.54	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1138/1277	3.68	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1279	****	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	8	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	9	2	0	3.18	286/ 382	3.18	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	8	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 442 0101
 Title INFO & CODING THEORY
 Instructor: LOMONACO JR, SA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 462
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	219/1576	4.83	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	161/1342	4.92	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1434	4.86	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.43	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	974/1277	3.60	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.90	4.17	4.31	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 443 0101
 Title CRYPTOLOGY
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 463
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	443/1576	4.64	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1145/1465	3.69	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1046/1554	3.92	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	920/1488	4.46	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	922/1486	4.31	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	834/1489	4.38	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	856/1277	3.80	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1279	****	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

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	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	5	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101
 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 464
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1568/1576	2.40	4.35	4.30	4.46	2.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1551/1576	2.80	4.24	4.27	4.35	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1184/1342	3.60	4.35	4.32	4.46	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1460/1465	2.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1093/1434	3.75	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1380/1547	3.40	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1343/1488	3.80	4.43	4.47	4.55	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1233/1486	3.80	4.24	4.32	4.41	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1236/1489	3.80	4.16	4.32	4.38	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	3.95	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	3.90	4.17	4.31	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.50	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	227/1576	4.82	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	20	4.61	476/1576	4.61	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	8	19	4.61	480/1342	4.61	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	5	3	14	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	4	5	4	12	3.96	905/1465	3.96	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	7	13	4.19	748/1434	4.19	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	624/1547	4.44	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	188/1574	4.96	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	12	14	4.48	422/1554	4.48	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	545/1486	4.62	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	552/1489	4.63	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	438/1277	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	****/1279	****	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	6	0	1	3.29	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	12	2	1	3.27	266/ 382	3.27	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.27	

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 465
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	11	Under-grad	29	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	3	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	527/1576	4.59	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	8	4.06	1107/1576	4.06	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	753/1342	4.35	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	937/1520	4.18	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1095/1465	3.76	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1204/1547	3.82	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1018/1574	4.59	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	649/1554	4.31	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	1165/1488	4.18	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	888/1493	4.76	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	973/1486	4.24	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	969/1489	4.24	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	630/1277	4.13	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	910/1279	3.88	3.90	4.17	4.31	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	400/ 878	4.20	3.49	4.05	4.33	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 5	Major 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 12	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CMSC 477 0101
 Title AGNT ARCH/MLTI-AGNT SY
 Instructor: MINER, DONALD P
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 467
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	373/1576	4.70	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1067/1576	4.11	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	900/1547	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.70	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1554	4.82	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	810/1488	4.56	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	766/1489	4.44	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	623/1277	4.14	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1279	4.83	3.90	4.17	4.31	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	125/ 878	4.83	3.49	4.05	4.33	4.83	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	232/ 326	3.17	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.17	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	281/ 382	3.20	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 478H 0101
 Title INTRO TO MACHINE LEARN
 Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 468
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	17	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	4	3	9	3.84	1035/1465	3.84	3.86	4.12	4.22	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	279/1434	4.65	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1152/1574	4.45	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	229/1554	4.71	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	401/1488	4.81	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	533/1277	4.25	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	697/1279	4.21	3.90	4.17	4.31	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	626/1269	4.54	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	755/ 878	3.33	3.49	4.05	4.33	3.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	196/ 375	3.83	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.83	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: CMSC 478H 0101
 Title INTRO TO MACHINE LEARN
 Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 468
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	12	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101
 Title: COMPUTER NETWORKS
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 469
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	4	11	4.05	1124/1576	4.05	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	6	6	4	3.27	1480/1576	3.27	4.24	4.27	4.35	3.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	5	7	5	3.41	1249/1342	3.41	4.35	4.32	4.46	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	3	3	6	5	3.61	1325/1520	3.61	4.24	4.25	4.38	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	2	3	11	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1033/1434	3.86	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	7	9	4.10	978/1547	4.10	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	1245/1574	4.35	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	4	0	9	5	0	2.83	1496/1554	2.83	4.07	4.10	4.24	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	3	4	8	3.79	1347/1488	3.79	4.43	4.47	4.55	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	1270/1493	4.42	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	10	4	3	3.37	1369/1486	3.37	4.24	4.32	4.41	3.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	2	3	5	5	3.39	1350/1489	3.39	4.16	4.32	4.38	3.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	5	2	2	6	3.60	974/1277	3.60	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1279	****	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.20	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	8	0	1	3.22	276/ 382	3.22	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	12	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 486 0101
 Title MOBILE RADIO COMM
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPINDE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 470
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	4	5	0	2.63	1564/1576	2.63	4.35	4.30	4.46	2.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	6	4	0	2.63	1562/1576	2.63	4.24	4.27	4.35	2.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	6	0	3.06	1289/1342	3.06	4.35	4.32	4.46	3.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	7	4	0	2.81	1492/1520	2.81	4.24	4.25	4.38	2.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	3	4	0	2.82	1425/1465	2.82	3.86	4.12	4.22	2.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1422/1434	2.43	4.09	4.14	4.30	2.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	7	2	1	2.87	1489/1547	2.87	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1528/1574	3.87	4.65	4.64	4.69	3.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	3	5	2	1	2.64	1515/1554	2.64	4.07	4.10	4.24	2.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	2	7	0	2.93	1459/1488	2.93	4.43	4.47	4.55	2.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	7	4	3	3.53	1471/1493	3.53	4.68	4.73	4.80	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	7	3	1	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.24	4.32	4.41	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	3	4	0	2.40	1473/1489	2.40	4.16	4.32	4.38	2.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	1	4	1	3	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	3.90	4.17	4.31	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	4.11	4.35	4.55	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	155/ 379	4.25	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	302/ 382	3.13	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.13	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	Major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	General 12
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Under-grad 14
				P 0	Non-major 12
				I 0	Electives 1
				? 0	Other 3
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 491A 0101
 Title INTRO TO PARALLEL COMP
 Instructor: DORBAND, JOHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 471
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	940/1576	4.26	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	8	3	4	3.32	1470/1576	3.32	4.24	4.27	4.35	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	3	4	6	2	3.31	1424/1520	3.31	4.24	4.25	4.38	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	716/1434	4.22	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	3	4	5	3	2	1	2.40	1521/1547	2.40	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	586/1574	4.84	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	6	6	2	3.22	1399/1554	3.39	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	5	5	5	3	3.21	1432/1488	3.55	4.43	4.47	4.55	3.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	1150/1493	4.61	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	6	6	1	3.05	1417/1486	3.18	4.24	4.32	4.41	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	7	5	1	2.89	1441/1489	2.97	4.16	4.32	4.38	2.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	1	4	3	4	3.13	1138/1277	3.19	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	3.90	4.17	4.31	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	70/ 379	4.56	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	213/ 326	3.25	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	6	4	0	3.40	235/ 382	3.40	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.40	

Course-Section: CMSC 491A 0101
 Title INTRO TO PARALLEL COMP
 Instructor: DORBAND, JOHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 471
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 491A 0101
 Title INTRO TO PARALLEL COMP
 Instructor: ZHOU, SHUJIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 472
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	940/1576	4.26	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	8	3	4	3.32	1470/1576	3.32	4.24	4.27	4.35	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	3	4	6	2	3.31	1424/1520	3.31	4.24	4.25	4.38	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	716/1434	4.22	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	3	4	5	3	2	1	2.40	1521/1547	2.40	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	586/1574	4.84	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	9	5	3	3.56	1285/1554	3.39	4.07	4.10	4.24	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	8	5	6	3.89	1318/1488	3.55	4.43	4.47	4.55	3.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	1089/1493	4.61	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	9	5	2	3.32	1379/1486	3.18	4.24	4.32	4.41	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	6	5	2	3.05	1412/1489	2.97	4.16	4.32	4.38	2.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	1	5	3	4	3.25	1107/1277	3.19	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	3.90	4.17	4.31	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.09	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	70/ 379	4.56	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	213/ 326	3.25	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	6	4	0	3.40	235/ 382	3.40	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.40	

Course-Section: CMSC 491A 0101
 Title INTRO TO PARALLEL COMP
 Instructor: ZHOU, SHUJIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 472
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 491I 0101
 Title INTRO TO IT SERVICES
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 473
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.24	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.16	4.32	4.38	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.95	4.03	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.90	4.17	4.31	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	3.49	4.05	4.33	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.21	4.20	4.19	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101
 Title SEMANTIC WEB
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 474
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1032/1576	4.15	4.24	4.27	4.35	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.24	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	3.86	4.12	4.22	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	844/1434	4.08	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1396/1547	3.33	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1128/1574	4.46	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	624/1488	4.69	4.43	4.47	4.55	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	708/1493	4.85	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	841/1486	4.38	4.24	4.32	4.41	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	921/1489	4.31	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.95	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	764/1279	4.11	3.90	4.17	4.31	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.89	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	742/ 878	3.40	3.49	4.05	4.33	3.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	165/ 379	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	66/ 79	4.20	4.78	4.69	4.69	4.20	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	46/ 72	4.60	4.92	4.64	4.64	4.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	75/ 80	3.80	4.66	4.61	4.52	3.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	2	1	8	0	1	2.75	369/ 375	2.75	3.32	4.01	3.90	2.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	10	1	1	3.25	213/ 326	3.25	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101
 Title SEMANTIC WEB
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 474
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 493 0101
 Title: GAMES GROUP PROJECT
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 475
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.35	4.30	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1548/1576	2.86	4.24	4.27	4.35	2.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1232/1520	3.80	4.24	4.25	4.38	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1416/1434	2.50	4.09	4.14	4.30	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1538/1547	2.00	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.65	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.07	4.10	4.24	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	2.33	1480/1488	2.33	4.43	4.47	4.55	2.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1321/1493	4.33	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1461/1486	2.67	4.24	4.32	4.41	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	1.33	1488/1489	1.33	4.16	4.32	4.38	1.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	3.95	4.03	4.04	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.90	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.13	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.11	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.19	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	3.90	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	3.97	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	3.88	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 601 0101
 Title RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 476
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	4.90	163/1576	4.90	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	311/1520	4.70	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	132/1465	4.89	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1547	4.78	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	339/1554	4.57	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	624/1488	4.70	4.43	4.47	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	404/1277	4.40	3.95	4.03	4.08	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	219/1279	4.80	3.90	4.17	4.34	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	511/1269	4.70	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	620/ 878	3.78	3.49	4.05	4.11	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.11	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.51	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	128/ 379	4.33	4.21	4.20	4.37	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	55/ 85	4.75	4.96	4.72	4.79	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	39/ 72	4.75	4.92	4.64	4.70	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.66	4.61	4.70	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	180/ 375	4.00	3.32	4.01	4.10	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	46/ 52	3.00	4.50	4.48	4.40	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	3.30	4.03	4.10	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	203/ 382	3.67	3.42	4.08	4.13	3.67	

Course-Section: CMSC 601 0101
 Title RESEARCH SKILLS FOR CS
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 476
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	1	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	9	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 635 0101
 Title ADV COMP GRAPHICS
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 477
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.35	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.24	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.43	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.95	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.90	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.37	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	157/ 326	4.00	3.30	4.03	4.10	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	4.13	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101
 Title DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 478
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	2	5	8	5	3.55	1431/1576	3.55	4.35	4.30	4.43	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	10	8	2	3.41	1438/1576	3.41	4.24	4.27	4.32	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	10	5	3.64	1175/1342	3.64	4.35	4.32	4.38	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	8	4	3.48	1373/1520	3.48	4.24	4.25	4.36	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	9	5	3.73	1123/1465	3.73	3.86	4.12	4.25	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	8	3.86	1027/1434	3.86	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	10	4	3.59	1307/1547	3.59	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	739/1574	4.76	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	9	5	2	3.41	1345/1554	3.41	4.07	4.10	4.18	3.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	8	6	4	3.41	1406/1488	3.41	4.43	4.47	4.52	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	1348/1493	4.27	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	5	7	3	3.18	1396/1486	3.18	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	6	3	5	3.09	1409/1489	3.09	4.16	4.32	4.38	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	5	2	7	2	1	2.53	1236/1277	2.53	3.95	4.03	4.08	2.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	0	8	2	2	2.88	1219/1279	2.88	3.90	4.17	4.34	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	4	3	4	4	3.38	1161/1270	3.38	4.13	4.35	4.53	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.11	4.35	4.55	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	849/ 878	2.50	3.49	4.05	4.11	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.37	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	1	9	0	0	2.73	369/ 375	2.73	3.32	4.01	4.10	2.73
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	9	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.10	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	4.13	****

Course-Section: CMSC 641 0101
 Title DESIGN & ANALY ALGORTH
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 478
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 652 0101
 Title CRYPTOGRAPHY & DATA SE
 Instructor: SHERMAN, ALAN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 479
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	513/1465	4.40	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.43	4.47	4.52	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.40	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	4.67	3.95	4.03	4.08	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	3.90	4.17	4.34	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.49	4.05	4.11	4.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.32	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	3.30	4.03	4.10	3.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	269/ 382	3.25	3.42	4.08	4.13	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	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	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 661 0101
 Title PRIN OF DATABASE SYS
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 480
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	203/1576	4.86	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.38	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	805/1547	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.65	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.83	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.43	4.47	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	856/1277	3.80	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	732/1279	4.17	3.90	4.17	4.34	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	871/1270	4.17	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.33	3.49	4.05	4.11	3.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.37	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	180/ 375	4.00	3.32	4.01	4.10	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.42	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 677 0101
 Title AGENT ARCH/MULTI-AGT S
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 481
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.35	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	3.86	4.12	4.25	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.43	4.47	4.52	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.24	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.95	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.90	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.49	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.21	4.20	4.37	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.96	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.78	4.69	4.77	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.92	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	70/ 80	4.00	4.66	4.61	4.70	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.42	4.08	4.13	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 687 0101
 Title INTRO NETWORK SECURITY
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPIINDE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 482
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	1	7	1	3.13	1522/1576	3.13	4.35	4.30	4.43	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	1	6	2	3.07	1518/1576	3.07	4.24	4.27	4.32	3.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	6	2	1	2.87	1317/1342	2.87	4.35	4.32	4.38	2.87		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	2	4	3	3.13	1458/1520	3.13	4.24	4.25	4.36	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	3	3	3.38	1299/1465	3.38	3.86	4.12	4.25	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	3	3	2	2.85	1398/1434	2.85	4.09	4.14	4.35	2.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	1	6	3	1	2.86	1491/1547	2.86	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1552/1574	3.57	4.65	4.64	4.75	3.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	5	1	1	5	2	2.86	1493/1554	2.86	4.07	4.10	4.18	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	2	5	3	3.36	1415/1488	3.36	4.43	4.47	4.52	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	0	7	5	4.07	1404/1493	4.07	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.07	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	3	5	3	3.36	1371/1486	3.36	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	3	4	2	2.93	1435/1489	2.93	4.16	4.32	4.38	2.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1095/1277	3.30	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	3	0	1	2.67	1236/1279	2.67	3.90	4.17	4.34	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1192/1270	3.17	4.13	4.35	4.53	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1195/1269	3.17	4.11	4.35	4.55	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.49	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	****	4.21	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.96	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.78	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	4.92	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.66	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	3.32	4.01	4.10	3.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.30	4.03	4.10	3.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	269/ 382	3.25	3.42	4.08	4.13	3.25	

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	5	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 691I 0101
 Title INTRO TO IT SERVICES
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 483
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1396/1547	3.33	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.43	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.68	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.24	4.32	4.37	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.16	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.95	4.03	4.08	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.25	3.90	4.17	4.34	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.13	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.49	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.30	4.35	4.37	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.37	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.96	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.92	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.66	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	3.32	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 52	4.00	4.50	4.48	4.40	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.50	3.30	4.03	4.10	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	219/ 382	3.50	3.42	4.08	4.13	3.50	

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

Course-Section: CMSC 691P 0101
 Title TEACHING CMSC IN PYTHO
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 484
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	203/1576	4.86	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1465	4.57	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1547	****	4.18	4.19	4.24	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.92	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.43	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.95	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	712/1279	4.20	3.90	4.17	4.34	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.49	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 691P 0101
 Title TEACHING CMSC IN PYTHO
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 485
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	203/1576	4.86	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.35	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	322/1465	4.57	3.86	4.12	4.25	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1547	****	4.18	4.19	4.24	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.65	4.64	4.75	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	4.92	4.07	4.10	4.18	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.43	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.68	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.24	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.16	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.95	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	712/1279	4.20	3.90	4.17	4.34	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.13	4.35	4.53	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.11	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.49	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	3.32	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.30	4.03	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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