

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 1
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	594/1449	4.64	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	704/1446	4.59	4.19	4.29	4.20	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	717/1256	4.59	4.28	4.34	4.21	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	504/1402	4.46	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1358	4.05	3.75	4.13	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	808/1327	4.42	4.08	4.16	3.92	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	247/1435	4.74	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	263/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	956/1437	4.35	4.02	4.12	4.04	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	443/1386	4.76	4.45	4.48	4.40	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	940/1390	4.83	4.70	4.74	4.67	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	702/1379	4.62	4.24	4.34	4.28	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	520/1379	4.70	4.20	4.36	4.26	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	383/1236	4.30	4.01	4.08	3.93	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	674/1121	4.09	3.99	4.18	3.89	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	479/1122	4.52	4.13	4.36	4.09	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	855/1121	4.36	4.20	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/790	4.00	3.70	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 1
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 1
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	22

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 2
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	218/1449	4.64	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	130/1446	4.59	4.19	4.29	4.20	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	141/1256	4.59	4.28	4.34	4.21	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	0	0	3	22	4.73	258/1402	4.46	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	781/1358	4.05	3.75	4.13	4.04	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	117/1327	4.42	4.08	4.16	3.92	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	0	29	4.90	84/1435	4.74	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	313/1437	4.35	4.02	4.12	4.04	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	337/1386	4.76	4.45	4.48	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	372/1390	4.83	4.70	4.74	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	223/1379	4.62	4.24	4.34	4.28	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	0	3	23	4.78	355/1379	4.70	4.20	4.36	4.26	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	153/1236	4.30	4.01	4.08	3.93	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	396/1121	4.09	3.99	4.18	3.89	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	537/1122	4.52	4.13	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	383/1121	4.36	4.20	4.40	4.08	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	24	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/790	4.00	3.70	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 2
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 2
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Block,Dawn M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	289/1449	4.64	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	531/1446	4.59	4.19	4.29	4.20	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	422/1256	4.59	4.28	4.34	4.21	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	8	15	4.50	528/1402	4.46	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	1	2	10	4.27	618/1358	4.05	3.75	4.13	4.04	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	253/1327	4.42	4.08	4.16	3.92	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	99/1435	4.74	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	421/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	417/1437	4.35	4.02	4.12	4.04	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	371/1386	4.76	4.45	4.48	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	684/1390	4.83	4.70	4.74	4.67	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	464/1379	4.62	4.24	4.34	4.28	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	310/1379	4.70	4.20	4.36	4.26	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	4	5	13	4.21	591/1236	4.30	4.01	4.08	3.93	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	547/1121	4.09	3.99	4.18	3.89	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	537/1122	4.52	4.13	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	731/1121	4.36	4.20	4.40	4.08	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	425/790	4.00	3.70	4.06	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 3
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Bergeron,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 4
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	567/1449	4.64	4.20	4.33	4.14	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	544/1446	4.59	4.19	4.29	4.20	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	501/1256	4.59	4.28	4.34	4.21	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	976/1402	4.46	4.26	4.27	4.10	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1033/1358	4.05	3.75	4.13	4.04	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	808/1327	4.42	4.08	4.16	3.92	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	532/1435	4.74	4.31	4.20	4.11	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	707/1446	4.92	4.77	4.67	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	406/1437	4.35	4.02	4.12	4.04	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	645/1386	4.76	4.45	4.48	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	735/1390	4.83	4.70	4.74	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	541/1379	4.62	4.24	4.34	4.28	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	600/1379	4.70	4.20	4.36	4.26	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	893/1236	4.30	4.01	4.08	3.93	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	971/1121	4.09	3.99	4.18	3.89	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1122	4.52	4.13	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1121	4.36	4.20	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/790	4.00	3.70	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 104 4
Title:	Prob Sol & Computer Prog
Instructor:	Park,John

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	35
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.82	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 7	Required for Majors	4 Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 104 4		Term - Spring 2011					Enrollment: 35									
Title: Prob Sol & Computer Prog							Questionnaires: 17									
Instructor: Park,John																
Questions		NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced																
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General			1	Under-grad	17	Non-major		12		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0											
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives			8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0											
				I	0	Other			1							
				?	3											

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	126
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	8	33	4.54	540/1449	4.40	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	36	4.76	230/1446	4.57	4.19	4.29	4.27	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	5	36	4.65	378/1256	4.58	4.28	4.34	4.36	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	8	31	4.71	293/1402	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	6	1	12	4	9	3.28	1249/1358	3.41	3.75	4.13	4.13	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	2	3	6	19	4.40	524/1327	4.38	4.08	4.16	4.12	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	9	32	4.49	505/1435	4.58	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	43	4.96	263/1446	4.95	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	21	21	4.50	364/1437	4.21	4.02	4.12	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	39	4.82	337/1386	4.73	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	41	4.89	582/1390	4.74	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	36	4.71	370/1379	4.61	4.24	4.34	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	8	4	31	4.42	766/1379	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.37	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	5	11	26	4.44	394/1236	4.24	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	4	4	22	4.60	335/1121	4.45	3.99	4.18	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	4	7	16	4.24	752/1122	4.04	4.13	4.36	4.34	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	770/1121	3.90	4.20	4.40	4.39	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	18	15	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	413/790	3.74	3.70	4.06	4.01	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	126
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	3.19	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/18	****	****	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	126
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	30
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 08
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	86
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	8	6	20	4.26	903/1449	4.40	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	11	19	4.38	724/1446	4.57	4.19	4.29	4.27	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	25	4.51	510/1256	4.58	4.28	4.34	4.36	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	2	9	17	4.33	734/1402	4.52	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	20	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	1159/1358	3.41	3.75	4.13	4.13	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	562/1327	4.38	4.08	4.16	4.12	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	26	4.68	302/1435	4.58	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	33	4.94	316/1446	4.95	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	1	0	5	12	6	3.92	1001/1437	4.21	4.02	4.12	4.10	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	8	25	4.65	645/1386	4.73	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	4	26	4.59	1088/1390	4.74	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	13	20	4.50	635/1379	4.61	4.24	4.34	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	8	17	4.06	1032/1379	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.37	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	5	11	13	4.03	698/1236	4.24	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	7	19	4.29	581/1121	4.45	3.99	4.18	4.11	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	2	5	7	13	3.83	940/1122	4.04	4.13	4.36	4.34	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	2	8	8	8	3.55	1002/1121	3.90	4.20	4.40	4.39	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	5	18	2	1	3	2	4	3.42	663/790	3.74	3.70	4.06	4.01	3.42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 201 08
Title:	Computer Science I
Instructor:	Evans,Susan A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	86
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	22	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	105
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	17	32	4.51	594/1449	4.54	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	11	36	4.52	557/1446	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.27	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	10	39	4.57	458/1256	4.60	4.28	4.34	4.36	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	14	31	4.58	432/1402	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	38	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	549/1358	4.35	3.75	4.13	4.13	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	180/1327	4.54	4.08	4.16	4.12	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	13	33	4.47	518/1435	4.57	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	50	4.96	211/1446	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	8	22	18	4.21	691/1437	4.38	4.02	4.12	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	42	4.72	516/1386	4.82	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	44	4.74	889/1390	4.81	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	15	34	4.54	599/1379	4.71	4.24	4.34	4.31	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	14	36	4.57	611/1379	4.61	4.20	4.36	4.37	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	4	16	28	4.50	331/1236	4.55	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	6	8	18	4.30	575/1121	4.10	3.99	4.18	4.11	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	7	4	20	4.27	734/1122	3.89	4.13	4.36	4.34	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	11	4	17	4.12	825/1121	3.88	4.20	4.40	4.39	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	21	23	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	105
Questionnaires:	54

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	3.19	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 202 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 105
Title: Computer Science II		Questionnaires: 54
Instructor: Bergeron,Ryan J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	22	Required for Majors	52	Graduate	0	Major	33
28-55	21	1.00-1.99	0	B	28						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	54	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 07
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	85
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	500/1449	4.54	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	252/1446	4.63	4.19	4.29	4.27	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	411/1256	4.60	4.28	4.34	4.36	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1402	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	521/1358	4.35	3.75	4.13	4.13	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	591/1327	4.54	4.08	4.16	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	21	4.67	313/1435	4.57	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	421/1446	4.94	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	321/1437	4.38	4.02	4.12	4.10	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	163/1386	4.82	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	582/1390	4.81	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	151/1379	4.71	4.24	4.34	4.31	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	520/1379	4.61	4.20	4.36	4.37	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	264/1236	4.55	4.01	4.08	4.16	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	806/1121	4.10	3.99	4.18	4.11	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	1	4	0	9	3.50	1005/1122	3.89	4.13	4.36	4.34	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	1	1	2	9	3.65	982/1121	3.88	4.20	4.40	4.39	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	10	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 202 07
Title:	Computer Science II
Instructor:	Hood, Daniel J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	85
Questionnaires:	28

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 15 Required for Majors	Graduate	0 Major 15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1 General	Under-grad	28 Non-major 13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 1 Electives		
			P 0		
			I 0 Other		
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 01
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Artola,Paul C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	14	11	3.89	1197/1449	3.59	4.20	4.33	4.32	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	9	15	4.00	1061/1446	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	20	4.37	675/1256	3.79	4.28	4.34	4.36	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	6	8	12	4.15	917/1402	3.83	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	5	0	2	5	7	3.47	1183/1358	3.57	3.75	4.13	4.13	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	1	2	8	10	4.00	847/1327	3.68	4.08	4.16	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	2	9	21	4.52	469/1435	3.76	4.31	4.20	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	473/1446	4.66	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	7	11	6	3.88	1029/1437	3.22	4.02	4.12	4.10	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	9	21	4.43	903/1386	3.97	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	5	27	4.66	1014/1390	4.55	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	7	4	11	12	3.74	1194/1379	3.44	4.24	4.34	4.31	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	5	7	18	4.03	1044/1379	3.62	4.20	4.36	4.37	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	4	0	3	6	5	3.44	1036/1236	2.85	4.01	4.08	4.16	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	3.32	3.99	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1122	3.69	4.13	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1121	3.74	4.20	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/790	1.50	3.70	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 01
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Artola,Paul C

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	35

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	27
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 02
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	10	7	0	2.91	1421/1449	3.59	4.20	4.33	4.32	2.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	10	7	3	3.39	1361/1446	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.27	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	5	8	3	3.23	1219/1256	3.79	4.28	4.34	4.36	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	5	8	1	3.53	1262/1402	3.83	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	12	4	4.00	827/1358	3.57	3.75	4.13	4.13	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	962/1327	3.68	4.08	4.16	4.12	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	4	8	8	3.91	1060/1435	3.76	4.31	4.20	4.17	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	263/1446	4.66	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	2	5	6	5	0	2.78	1401/1437	3.22	4.02	4.12	4.10	2.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	9	6	7	3.91	1235/1386	3.97	4.45	4.48	4.46	3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	11	7	4.04	1325/1390	4.55	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	4	6	6	3.43	1284/1379	3.44	4.24	4.34	4.31	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	4	7	5	3.30	1308/1379	3.62	4.20	4.36	4.37	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	0	3	6	7	3.74	921/1236	2.85	4.01	4.08	4.16	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/1121	3.32	3.99	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/1122	3.69	4.13	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/1121	3.74	4.20	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/790	1.50	3.70	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 02
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	2.00	2.00	4.29	4.10	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	2.50	2.50	4.15	3.19	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	1.50	1.50	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	3.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 02
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	23

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

? 0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Chettri,Samir R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1320/1449	3.59	4.20	4.33	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1180/1446	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.27	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	936/1256	3.79	4.28	4.34	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1274/1402	3.83	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1296/1358	3.57	3.75	4.13	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1240/1327	3.68	4.08	4.16	4.12	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	1	1	1	2.86	1393/1435	3.76	4.31	4.20	4.17	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1079/1446	4.66	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1364/1437	3.22	4.02	4.12	4.10	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1348/1386	3.97	4.45	4.48	4.46	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1097/1390	4.55	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1311/1379	3.44	4.24	4.34	4.31	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1284/1379	3.62	4.20	4.36	4.37	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1231/1236	2.85	4.01	4.08	4.16	1.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1039/1121	3.32	3.99	4.18	4.11	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1082/1122	3.69	4.13	4.36	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	934/1121	3.74	4.20	4.40	4.39	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	790/790	1.50	3.70	4.06	4.01	1.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Chettri,Samir R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	202/205	2.00	2.00	4.29	4.10	2.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	3.96	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	33/35	2.50	2.50	4.15	3.19	2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.74	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	31/31	1.50	1.50	4.34	2.63	1.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 03
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Chettri,Samir R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	8

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

? 0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 203 04
Title:	Discrete Structures
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	7	11	3.92	1170/1449	3.59	4.20	4.33	4.32	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	9	8	3.92	1133/1446	3.79	4.19	4.29	4.27	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	8	5	8	3.56	1153/1256	3.79	4.28	4.34	4.36	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	917/1402	3.83	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	2	1	10	7	3.82	1010/1358	3.57	3.75	4.13	4.13	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1043/1327	3.68	4.08	4.16	4.12	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	8	8	6	3.75	1165/1435	3.76	4.31	4.20	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	8	4.33	1151/1446	4.66	4.77	4.67	4.63	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	3	2	6	9	2	3.23	1341/1437	3.22	4.02	4.12	4.10	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	1052/1386	3.97	4.45	4.48	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	425/1390	4.55	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	6	4	9	4	3.28	1311/1379	3.44	4.24	4.34	4.31	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	2	5	12	3.72	1193/1379	3.62	4.20	4.36	4.37	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	4	1	3	2	1	2.55	1203/1236	2.85	4.01	4.08	4.16	2.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	931/1121	3.32	3.99	4.18	4.11	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	656/1122	3.69	4.13	4.36	4.34	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	986/1121	3.74	4.20	4.40	4.39	3.63

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 203 04	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 49
Title: Discrete Structures		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Sherman, Alan T		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	9	8	15	3.86	1207/1449	3.86	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	8	18	4.03	1050/1446	4.03	4.19	4.29	4.33	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	5	10	20	4.24	791/1256	4.24	4.28	4.34	4.39	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	13	20	4.34	725/1402	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	5	3	6	6	8	3.32	1236/1358	3.32	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	9	21	4.30	629/1327	4.30	4.08	4.16	4.23	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	2	9	5	17	3.94	1024/1435	3.94	4.31	4.20	4.25	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	3	13	18	3	3.57	1429/1446	3.57	4.77	4.67	4.68	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	9	12	7	3.80	1082/1437	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	6	8	18	4.08	1151/1386	4.08	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	5	26	4.56	1116/1390	4.56	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	9	6	16	3.89	1133/1379	3.89	4.24	4.34	4.38	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	5	4	6	6	13	3.53	1249/1379	3.53	4.20	4.36	4.40	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	2	1	5	5	8	3.76	904/1236	3.76	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	1	3	0	6	3.82	832/1121	3.82	3.99	4.18	4.31	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	857/1122	4.00	4.13	4.36	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	190/1121	4.92	4.20	4.40	4.53	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	26	5	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 304 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 55
Title: Social/Ethical Iss In IT		Questionnaires: 38
Instructor: Wilson, Richard		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2 A 32	Required for Majors	31 Graduate 0 Major 27
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 2		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 38 Non-major 11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 4	Other	0

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	209/1449	4.72	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	297/1446	4.71	4.19	4.29	4.33	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	247/1256	4.70	4.28	4.34	4.39	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	504/1402	4.46	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	4	2	3	1	8	3.39	1212/1358	3.63	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	512/1327	4.46	4.08	4.16	4.23	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	226/1435	4.70	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	147/1437	4.73	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	163/1386	4.86	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1390	4.95	4.70	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	187/1379	4.70	4.24	4.34	4.38	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	253/1379	4.77	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	290/1236	4.57	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	27

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 25	Graduate 0 Major 25
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 27 Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	446/1449	4.72	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	285/1446	4.71	4.19	4.29	4.33	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	422/1256	4.70	4.28	4.34	4.39	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	670/1402	4.46	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	970/1358	3.63	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	404/1327	4.46	4.08	4.16	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	313/1435	4.70	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	192/1437	4.73	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	371/1386	4.86	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	531/1390	4.95	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	576/1379	4.70	4.24	4.34	4.38	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	461/1379	4.77	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	277/1236	4.57	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 1
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	79
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	6	17	20	4.22	929/1449	4.22	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	3	9	16	15	3.93	1124/1446	3.93	4.19	4.29	4.33	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	11	19	12	3.93	992/1256	3.93	4.28	4.34	4.39	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	2	7	8	22	4.28	781/1402	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	10	9	9	11	3.30	1244/1358	3.30	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	14	3	1	1	12	14	4.06	814/1327	4.06	4.08	4.16	4.23	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	5	15	23	4.29	739/1435	4.29	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	473/1446	4.91	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	10	17	11	3.97	912/1437	3.97	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	2	4	13	20	4.15	1123/1386	4.15	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	5	34	4.71	940/1390	4.71	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	4	7	13	18	4.07	1030/1379	4.07	4.24	4.34	4.38	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	5	6	13	17	3.95	1089/1379	3.95	4.20	4.36	4.40	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	2	9	13	15	4.05	692/1236	4.05	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	41	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 1
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Nicholas, Charle

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	79
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 331 1
Title:	Prin Of Prog Languages
Instructor:	Nicholas,Charle

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	79
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	38
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	119/1449	4.59	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	208/1446	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.33	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	433/1256	4.43	4.28	4.34	4.39	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	281/1402	4.43	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	5	6	2	3.40	1204/1358	3.56	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	611/1327	4.30	4.08	4.16	4.23	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	236/1435	4.54	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	184/1437	4.14	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	102/1386	4.68	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1390	4.78	4.70	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	223/1379	4.28	4.24	4.34	4.38	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	281/1379	4.38	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	362/1236	4.15	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1121	4.00	3.99	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1122	4.13	4.13	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1121	4.25	4.20	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	46
Questionnaires:	23

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 2
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	967/1449	4.59	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1168/1446	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.33	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	834/1256	4.43	4.28	4.34	4.39	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	908/1402	4.43	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1186/1358	3.56	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	637/1327	4.30	4.08	4.16	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	644/1435	4.54	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1446	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	7	4	0	3.15	1352/1437	4.14	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	1045/1386	4.68	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	1134/1390	4.78	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	3	3	3.47	1274/1379	4.28	4.24	4.34	4.38	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	3	3.56	1240/1379	4.38	4.20	4.36	4.40	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1078/1236	4.15	4.01	4.08	4.18	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1121	4.00	3.99	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1122	4.13	4.13	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1121	4.25	4.20	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 2
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Peng, Yun

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	16

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7 Required for Majors	12	Graduate 1 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 4 General	1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0	0	Electives 0 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			Other	2	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 3
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	390/1449	4.59	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	505/1446	4.40	4.19	4.29	4.33	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	19	4.48	544/1256	4.43	4.28	4.34	4.39	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	8	15	4.42	641/1402	4.43	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	7	7	8	3.83	994/1358	3.56	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	2	9	12	4.29	629/1327	4.30	4.08	4.16	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	10	16	4.52	469/1435	4.54	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	421/1446	4.96	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	9	16	4.54	338/1437	4.14	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	354/1386	4.68	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	761/1390	4.78	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	576/1379	4.28	4.24	4.34	4.38	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	400/1379	4.38	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	249/1236	4.15	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	727/1121	4.00	3.99	4.18	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	821/1122	4.13	4.13	4.36	4.46	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	770/1121	4.25	4.20	4.40	4.53	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 341 3
Title:	Data Structures
Instructor:	Frey,Dennis L

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 1
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	8	9	3.81	1237/1449	3.99	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	918/1446	4.08	4.19	4.29	4.33	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	1023/1256	3.90	4.28	4.34	4.39	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	9	10	4.16	898/1402	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	6	6	9	3.68	1081/1358	3.62	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	11	9	3.92	915/1327	3.73	4.08	4.16	4.23	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	788/1435	4.08	4.31	4.20	4.25	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	2	0	0	2	21	4.60	949/1446	4.28	4.77	4.67	4.68	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	2	6	10	6	3.83	1062/1437	3.90	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	498/1386	4.67	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	1079/1390	4.67	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	702/1379	4.51	4.24	4.34	4.38	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	8	12	4.48	717/1379	4.47	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	415/1236	4.26	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 345 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 28
Title: Software Design/Develop		Questionnaires: 26
Instructor: Mitchell,Susan		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13 Required for Majors	21 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 0 General	0	Under-grad 26 Non-major
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 2
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	12	13	4.17	977/1449	3.99	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	14	9	3.97	1097/1446	4.08	4.19	4.29	4.33	3.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	6	8	10	3.92	1000/1256	3.90	4.28	4.34	4.39	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	3	12	10	4.15	908/1402	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.37	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	10	9	5	3.56	1149/1358	3.62	3.75	4.13	4.14	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	0	8	6	8	3.54	1115/1327	3.73	4.08	4.16	4.23	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	6	10	10	3.93	1042/1435	4.08	4.31	4.20	4.25	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	17	6	3.96	1372/1446	4.28	4.77	4.67	4.68	3.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	9	9	3.96	927/1437	3.90	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	716/1386	4.67	4.45	4.48	4.53	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	22	4.74	889/1390	4.67	4.70	4.74	4.76	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	7	18	4.56	576/1379	4.51	4.24	4.34	4.38	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	6	17	4.46	727/1379	4.47	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	0	3	7	11	4.09	681/1236	4.26	4.01	4.08	4.18	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 345 2
Title:	Software Design/Develop
Instructor:	Mitchell,Susan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 1
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Younis,Mohamed

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	553/1449	4.27	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	724/1446	4.21	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	665/1256	4.49	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	179/1402	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1092/1358	3.57	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	553/1327	4.19	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	313/1435	4.55	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	550/1437	4.17	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	183/1386	4.85	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1390	4.92	4.70	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	541/1379	4.48	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	267/1379	4.50	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	242/1236	4.34	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 1
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Younis,Mohamed

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	3.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.20	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 411 1
Title:	Computer Architecture
Instructor:	Younis,Mohamed

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	11	7	4.00	1106/1449	4.27	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	12	8	4.04	1039/1446	4.21	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	433/1256	4.49	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	734/1402	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	4	6	6	3.48	1183/1358	3.57	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	847/1327	4.19	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	6	16	4.44	558/1435	4.55	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	211/1446	4.98	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	6	12	6	4.00	868/1437	4.17	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	389/1386	4.85	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	710/1390	4.92	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	796/1379	4.48	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	970/1379	4.50	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	2	10	8	4.05	695/1236	4.34	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	3.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 1
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	77
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	13	21	4.39	745/1449	4.39	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	10	19	4.18	935/1446	4.18	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	11	14	3.95	984/1256	3.95	4.28	4.34	4.43	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	6	12	12	4.06	983/1402	4.06	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	4	8	6	17	4.03	816/1358	4.03	3.75	4.13	4.21	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	7	11	11	4.07	814/1327	4.07	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	8	8	17	4.11	908/1435	4.11	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	1	0	0	1	32	4.85	627/1446	4.85	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	4	8	20	4.35	527/1437	4.35	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	8	25	4.54	764/1386	4.54	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	633/1390	4.86	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	8	22	4.42	756/1379	4.42	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	7	23	4.36	814/1379	4.36	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	4	12	13	4.10	678/1236	4.10	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 421 1
Title:	Princ Of Oper Systems
Instructor:	Kalpakis,Konsta

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	77
Questionnaires:	38

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10 Required for Majors	32 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 18		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 5	C 4 General	0	
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 1 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	1	
			? 5		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 427 1
Title:	Wearable Computing
Instructor:	Segall,Zary

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	2	4	6	8	3.86	1212/1449	3.86	4.20	4.33	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	7	3	7	3.55	1315/1446	3.55	4.19	4.29	4.34	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1256	****	4.28	4.34	4.43	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	5	4	4	7	3.52	1164/1358	3.52	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	6	5	5	3.32	1204/1327	3.32	4.08	4.16	4.28	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	4	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	1024/1435	3.94	4.31	4.20	4.27	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	764/1446	4.77	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1117/1437	3.75	4.02	4.12	4.20	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	1075/1386	4.23	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	659/1390	4.86	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	960/1379	4.18	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1125/1379	3.90	4.20	4.36	4.44	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	568/1236	4.24	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 427 1
Title:	Wearable Computing
Instructor:	Segall,Zary

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 5 Major 21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 13	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1237/1449	4.19	4.20	4.33	4.46	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1151/1446	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.34	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	1016/1256	4.24	4.28	4.34	4.43	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	697/1402	4.50	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1113/1358	3.90	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	950/1327	4.24	4.08	4.16	4.28	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	818/1435	4.50	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1176/1446	4.63	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1245/1437	4.14	4.02	4.12	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1177/1386	4.48	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1346/1390	4.42	4.70	4.74	4.78	3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1316/1379	3.95	4.24	4.34	4.40	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1182/1379	4.13	4.20	4.36	4.44	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1197/1236	3.58	4.01	4.08	4.13	2.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	2									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 441 2
Title:	Algorithms
Instructor:	Chang,Richard

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	20	4.58	486/1449	4.19	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	20	4.61	425/1446	4.26	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	22	4.58	450/1256	4.24	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	385/1402	4.50	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	5	8	9	4.18	698/1358	3.90	3.75	4.13	4.21	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	309/1327	4.24	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	163/1435	4.50	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	211/1446	4.63	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	140/1437	4.14	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	82/1386	4.48	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	213/1390	4.42	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	8	19	4.64	464/1379	3.95	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	10	17	4.52	677/1379	4.13	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	331/1236	3.58	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 441 2	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 44
Title: Algorithms		Questionnaires: 31
Instructor: Chang, Richard		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	2
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	7	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	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 443 1
Title:	Cryptology
Instructor:	Sherman,Alan T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1449	4.83	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	953/1446	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	232/1358	4.67	3.75	4.13	4.21	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	847/1327	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1209/1435	3.67	4.31	4.20	4.27	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1446	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	735/1437	4.17	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.70	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1058/1379	4.00	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	970/1379	4.17	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	220/1236	4.67	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 443 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 15
Title: Cryptology		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor: Sherman, Alan T		

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							
				P	0										
				I	0	Other	0								
				?	0										

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 445 01
Title:	Software Engineering
Instructor:	Segall,Zary

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	6	8	4.00	1106/1449	4.00	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	10	4.16	962/1446	4.16	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	798/1256	4.23	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	752/1402	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	3	6	3.37	1220/1358	3.37	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	819/1327	4.06	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1084/1435	3.88	4.31	4.20	4.27	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	984/1446	4.56	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	868/1437	4.00	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	840/1386	4.47	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1036/1390	4.63	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	893/1379	4.26	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	10	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	616/1236	4.18	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	547/1121	4.33	3.99	4.18	4.39	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	631/1122	4.40	4.13	4.36	4.54	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	524/1121	4.60	4.20	4.40	4.60	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 445 01
Title:	Software Engineering
Instructor:	Segall,Zary

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	19

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	2	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 451 1
Title:	Automata Thry& Form Lang
Instructor:	Yesha,Yaacov

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	5	2	3	0	2.29	1448/1449	2.29	4.20	4.33	4.46	2.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	2	5	3.36	1369/1446	3.36	4.19	4.29	4.34	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	907/1256	4.07	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1402	****	4.26	4.27	4.35	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	6	0	2	1	3	2.58	1342/1358	2.58	3.75	4.13	4.21	2.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1220/1327	3.25	4.08	4.16	4.28	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	449/1435	4.54	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1446	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	4	6	1	0	2.58	1413/1437	2.58	4.02	4.12	4.20	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1324/1386	3.46	4.45	4.48	4.55	3.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1303/1390	4.15	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	4	5	3.57	1244/1379	3.57	4.24	4.34	4.40	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	3	2	3	3.00	1334/1379	3.00	4.20	4.36	4.44	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	****	4.01	4.08	4.13	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 451 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 24
Title: Automata Thry& Form Lang		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Yesha,Yaacov		

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 461 1
Title:	Database Mangmt Systems
Instructor:	Grasso,Clare T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	3	8	14	4.14	1007/1449	4.14	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	6	8	12	4.00	1061/1446	4.00	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	7	15	4.30	756/1256	4.30	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	5	4	14	4.16	898/1402	4.16	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	2	1	6	4	5	3.50	1174/1358	3.50	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	847/1327	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	4	4	14	4.00	970/1435	4.00	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	16	9	4.27	1204/1446	4.27	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	11	10	3	3.50	1245/1437	3.50	4.02	4.12	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	3	9	12	4.19	1095/1386	4.19	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	1162/1390	4.50	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	14	6	3.92	1110/1379	3.92	4.24	4.34	4.40	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	7	5	10	3.69	1204/1379	3.69	4.20	4.36	4.44	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	5	2	3	9	3.70	938/1236	3.70	4.01	4.08	4.13	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 461 1
Title:	Database Mangmt Systems
Instructor:	Grasso,Clare T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.91	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	4.16	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	1	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 478 01
Title:	Machine Learning
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	167/1449	4.86	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	311/1446	4.69	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	247/1256	4.78	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	190/1402	4.79	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	4	4	5	14	3.86	970/1358	3.86	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	8	24	4.62	299/1327	4.62	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	215/1435	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	24	4.69	868/1446	4.69	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	68/1437	4.91	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	237/1386	4.89	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.70	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	31	4.83	211/1379	4.83	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	225/1379	4.86	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	1	4	4	13	4.17	616/1236	4.17	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	326/1121	4.62	3.99	4.18	4.39	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	233/1122	4.85	4.13	4.36	4.54	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	281/1121	4.85	4.20	4.40	4.60	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	23	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	111/790	4.73	3.70	4.06	4.27	4.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 478 01
Title:	Machine Learning
Instructor:	Oates,James T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	36

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 10 Major 33
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 18	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	7	7	4	3.29	1396/1449	3.29	4.20	4.33	4.46	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	7	8	2	4	2.88	1424/1446	2.88	4.19	4.29	4.34	2.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	7	4	3.50	1163/1256	3.50	4.28	4.34	4.43	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	1	9	3	2	3.25	1331/1402	3.25	4.26	4.27	4.35	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	2	1	4	1	3.22	1266/1358	3.22	3.75	4.13	4.21	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1061/1327	3.67	4.08	4.16	4.28	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	6	6	6	5	3.43	1285/1435	3.43	4.31	4.20	4.27	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	10	13	4.46	1057/1446	4.46	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	6	10	3	2	2.95	1375/1437	2.95	4.02	4.12	4.20	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	3.75	1272/1386	3.75	4.45	4.48	4.55	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	6	6	10	4.09	1319/1390	4.09	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	5	6	7	3.54	1251/1379	3.54	4.24	4.34	4.40	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	2	5	8	3.33	1303/1379	3.33	4.20	4.36	4.44	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	4	2	7	2	3	2.89	1170/1236	2.89	4.01	4.08	4.13	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1122	****	4.13	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1121	****	4.20	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	44
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.91	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	4.16	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.20	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	12	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 487 1
Title:	Intro Network Security
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	1	6	3	3.27	1399/1449	3.27	4.20	4.33	4.46	3.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	0	6	3	3.13	1404/1446	3.13	4.19	4.29	4.34	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	8	1	3.19	1225/1256	3.19	4.28	4.34	4.43	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	0	1	4	2	3.20	1338/1402	3.20	4.26	4.27	4.35	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.75	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1212/1327	3.29	4.08	4.16	4.28	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	8	2	3.47	1275/1435	3.47	4.31	4.20	4.27	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1095/1446	4.40	4.77	4.67	4.71	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	1	3	2	1	2.42	1425/1437	2.42	4.02	4.12	4.20	2.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	1	3	5	2	3.00	1362/1386	3.00	4.45	4.48	4.55	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	6	3	3.67	1366/1390	3.67	4.70	4.74	4.78	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	2	4	3	3.07	1336/1379	3.07	4.24	4.34	4.40	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	0	3	4	3	3.14	1328/1379	3.14	4.20	4.36	4.44	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1012/1236	3.50	4.01	4.08	4.13	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	955/1121	3.44	3.99	4.18	4.39	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1051/1122	3.22	4.13	4.36	4.54	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1058/1121	3.22	4.20	4.40	4.60	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 487 1
Title:	Intro Network Security
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.91	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.33	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 487 1
Title:	Intro Network Security
Instructor:	Sidhu,Deepinder

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	16

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

? 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 01
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	783/1449	4.53	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	1011/1446	4.25	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	826/1256	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	734/1402	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	698/1358	4.49	3.75	4.13	4.21	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	721/1327	4.45	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	479/1435	4.50	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	304/1437	4.62	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1015/1386	4.55	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.70	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	518/1379	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	786/1379	4.40	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	516/1236	4.59	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	347/1121	3.79	3.99	4.18	4.39	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1122	4.17	4.13	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	591/1121	4.08	4.20	4.40	4.60	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	562/790	3.75	3.70	4.06	4.27	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 01
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	desJardins,Mari

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	3.43	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	38/67	4.70	4.48	4.58	4.47	4.70
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	47/66	4.32	4.03	4.36	4.33	4.32
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	37/64	4.20	4.10	4.25	4.24	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	43/75	4.45	4.10	4.32	4.27	4.45
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	3	1	5	11	4.20	36/73	4.20	3.98	4.00	4.09	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 491 02
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	320/1449	4.53	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/1446	4.25	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	269/1256	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.43	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	179/1402	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	128/1358	4.49	3.75	4.13	4.21	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	209/1327	4.45	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	479/1435	4.50	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	226/1437	4.62	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	371/1386	4.55	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.70	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	635/1379	4.55	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	786/1379	4.40	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	87/1236	4.59	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1052/1121	3.79	3.99	4.18	4.39	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1032/1122	4.17	4.13	4.36	4.54	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	978/1121	4.08	4.20	4.40	4.60	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 491 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 12
Title: Spec Topics In Comp Sci		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Olano, Thomas M		

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 493 1
Title:	Games Group Project
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	209/1449	4.81	4.20	4.33	4.46	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	664/1446	4.44	4.19	4.29	4.34	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	****	4.28	4.34	4.43	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	0	6	5	4.08	976/1402	4.08	4.26	4.27	4.35	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1358	****	3.75	4.13	4.21	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1215/1327	3.27	4.08	4.16	4.28	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	818/1435	4.20	4.31	4.20	4.27	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	659/1437	4.23	4.02	4.12	4.20	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	691/1386	4.62	4.45	4.48	4.55	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	855/1390	4.77	4.70	4.74	4.78	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	504/1379	4.62	4.24	4.34	4.40	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	727/1379	4.46	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	492/1236	4.33	4.01	4.08	4.13	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	727/1121	4.00	3.99	4.18	4.39	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	930/1122	3.88	4.13	4.36	4.54	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	710/1121	4.38	4.20	4.40	4.60	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	359/790	4.20	3.70	4.06	4.27	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 493 1
Title:	Games Group Project
Instructor:	Olano,Thomas M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors	12	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0 General	0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0 Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	1	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 601 1
Title:	Research Skills For Cs
Instructor:	Finin, Timothy W

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	1106/1449	4.00	4.20	4.33	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	988/1446	4.13	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	983/1402	4.07	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	9	1	3.64	1102/1358	3.64	3.75	4.13	4.18	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	572/1327	4.36	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	918/1435	4.10	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	769/1437	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.17	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.45	4.48	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	980/1390	4.69	4.70	4.74	4.77	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	729/1379	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	997/1379	4.13	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	709/1236	4.00	4.01	4.08	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	854/1121	3.75	3.99	4.18	4.29	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	691/1122	4.33	4.13	4.36	4.44	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	683/1121	4.42	4.20	4.40	4.52	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	379/790	4.17	3.70	4.06	4.08	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 601 1
Title:	Research Skills For Cs
Instructor:	Finin, Timothy W

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	3.91	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.54	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.10	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.16	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	56/67	4.25	4.48	4.58	4.67	4.25
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	56/66	3.75	4.03	4.36	4.36	3.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	43/64	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.32	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	62/75	3.75	4.10	4.32	4.37	3.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	50/73	3.75	3.98	4.00	4.02	3.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.79	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 601 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 28
Title: Research Skills For Cs		Questionnaires: 16
Instructor: Finin, Timothy W		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Major 12
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 9	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 641 1
Title:	Design & Analy Algorithms
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	2	7	12	11	3.67	1304/1449	3.67	4.20	4.33	4.41	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	12	18	4.22	896/1446	4.22	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	1	8	22	4.25	784/1256	4.25	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	4	3	7	16	4.17	898/1402	4.17	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	3	8	19	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.75	4.13	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	0	7	17	4.25	662/1327	4.25	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	313/1435	4.67	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.77	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	3	15	10	3.91	1016/1437	3.91	4.02	4.12	4.17	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	8	23	4.42	916/1386	4.42	4.45	4.48	4.47	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	9	26	4.64	1036/1390	4.64	4.70	4.74	4.77	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	2	13	17	4.14	996/1379	4.14	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	5	20	4.09	1019/1379	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	2	1	8	7	5	3.52	1005/1236	3.52	4.01	4.08	3.94	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	716/1121	4.04	3.99	4.18	4.29	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	9	11	4.35	682/1122	4.35	4.13	4.36	4.44	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	621/1121	4.48	4.20	4.40	4.52	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	14	13	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	666/790	3.40	3.70	4.06	4.08	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 641 1
Title:	Design & Analy Algorithms
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	3.91	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.54	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.10	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.16	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.79	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 641 1
Title:	Design & Analy Algorithms
Instructor:	Lomonaco JR,Sam

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	45
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	32	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	15	Major	34
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 661 02
Title:	Prin Of Database Sys
Instructor:	Grasso,Michael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	1077/1449	4.06	4.20	4.33	4.41	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	9	4.24	885/1446	4.24	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	556/1256	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	1	6	4	3.77	1167/1402	3.77	4.26	4.27	4.26	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	796/1358	4.07	3.75	4.13	4.18	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	4	2	6	3.44	1157/1327	3.44	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	336/1435	4.65	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	908/1446	4.65	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	550/1437	4.33	4.02	4.12	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	1052/1386	4.25	4.45	4.48	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	980/1390	4.69	4.70	4.74	4.77	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	850/1379	4.31	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	12	4.44	756/1379	4.44	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	4	1	8	4.00	709/1236	4.00	4.01	4.08	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	803/1121	3.91	3.99	4.18	4.29	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	787/1122	4.18	4.13	4.36	4.44	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	715/1121	4.36	4.20	4.40	4.52	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 661 02
Title:	Prin Of Database Sys
Instructor:	Grasso,Michael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	3.91	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	10	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CMSC 661 02	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 20
Title: Prin Of Database Sys		Questionnaires: 17
Instructor: Grasso,Michael		

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

84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		3						
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 668 01
Title:	Service Oriented Computi
Instructor:	Halem,Milton

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1007/1449	4.14	4.20	4.33	4.41	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1022/1446	4.07	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	879/1256	4.13	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	849/1402	4.21	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1076/1358	3.69	3.75	4.13	4.18	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1012/1327	3.77	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1101/1435	3.86	4.31	4.20	4.23	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1446	4.83	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	3	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	868/1437	4.00	4.02	4.12	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	903/1386	4.43	4.45	4.48	4.47	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	659/1390	4.86	4.70	4.74	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	876/1379	4.29	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	1023/1379	4.07	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	893/1236	3.79	4.01	4.08	3.94	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	787/1121	3.92	3.99	4.18	4.29	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	804/1122	4.15	4.13	4.36	4.44	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	813/1121	4.15	4.20	4.40	4.52	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	572/790	3.73	3.70	4.06	4.08	3.73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 668 01
Title:	Service Oriented Computi
Instructor:	Halem,Milton

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	3.91	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/205	****	2.00	4.29	3.54	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.10	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.16	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.48	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.03	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.10	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.10	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.98	4.00	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	2.50	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.79	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	1.50	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 668 01
Title:	Service Oriented Computi
Instructor:	Halem,Milton

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 02
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Carback,Richard

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	289/1449	4.74	4.20	4.33	4.41	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	13	4.48	610/1446	4.48	4.19	4.29	4.30	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	501/1256	4.52	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	456/1402	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.26	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	618/1358	4.26	3.75	4.13	4.18	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	9	11	4.26	654/1327	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	236/1435	4.74	4.31	4.20	4.23	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	764/1446	4.77	4.77	4.67	4.81	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	118/1437	4.80	4.02	4.12	4.17	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	963/1386	4.36	4.45	4.48	4.47	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	633/1390	4.86	4.70	4.74	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	477/1379	4.64	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	484/1379	4.68	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	452/1236	4.38	4.01	4.08	3.94	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	547/1121	4.33	3.99	4.18	4.29	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	798/1122	4.17	4.13	4.36	4.44	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1121	4.50	4.20	4.40	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	****	3.70	4.06	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CMSC 691 02
Title:	Spec Topics In Comp Sci
Instructor:	Carback,Richard

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	11	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						