

Course-Section: CMSC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMPUTERS/PRO
 Instructor: KATZ, HENRY S
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 326
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	5	5	2	2.95	1463/1504	2.95	4.08	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	3	5	3.47	1317/1503	3.47	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	7	2	4	3.35	1188/1290	3.35	4.08	4.28	4.19	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	6	5	4	2	3.12	1392/1453	3.12	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	7	3	7	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.40	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	5	3	5	0	2.86	1321/1365	2.86	3.96	4.08	3.96	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	4	3	8	3.79	1158/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.13	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	13	1	3.74	1469/1504	3.74	4.77	4.69	4.66	3.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	1	8	3	2	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	3.76	4.06	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	7	4	3	3.28	1342/1425	3.28	4.20	4.41	4.36	3.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1373/1426	3.67	4.59	4.69	4.56	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	3	6	3	3.22	1311/1418	3.22	4.06	4.25	4.20	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	3	4	3	2.89	1345/1416	2.89	3.98	4.26	4.21	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	2	5	3	3	3.06	1045/1199	3.06	3.88	3.97	3.82	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	7	4	1	0	2.20	1280/1312	2.20	3.47	4.00	3.69	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	6	2	0	2.50	1246/1303	2.50	3.75	4.24	3.93	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	3	8	2	0	2.79	1229/1299	2.79	3.84	4.25	3.94	2.79
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.11	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.42	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.33	4.60	4.48	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CMSC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMPUTERS/PRO
 Instructor: KATZ, HENRY S
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 326
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 103 0101
 Title SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING
 Instructor: KATZ, HENRY S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 327
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.08	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1278/1503	3.58	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1135/1290	3.58	4.08	4.28	4.19	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1104/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	3.40	4.00	3.91	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	708/1365	4.13	3.96	4.08	3.96	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.11	4.16	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	3	0	3.20	1340/1483	3.35	3.76	4.06	3.97	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1132/1425	4.09	4.20	4.41	4.36	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.56	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1089/1418	3.92	4.06	4.25	4.20	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	1	3.33	1281/1416	3.33	3.98	4.26	4.21	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1101/1199	2.88	3.88	3.97	3.82	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.47	4.00	3.69	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1131/1303	3.44	3.75	4.24	3.93	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	883/1299	4.13	3.84	4.25	3.94	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	3.36	4.01	3.80	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 103 0101
 Title SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING
 Instructor: KATZ, HENRY S (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 328
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.08	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1278/1503	3.58	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1135/1290	3.58	4.08	4.28	4.19	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1104/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	3.40	4.00	3.91	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	708/1365	4.13	3.96	4.08	3.96	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.11	4.16	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.35	3.76	4.06	3.97	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	4.09	4.20	4.41	4.36	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.56	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.92	4.06	4.25	4.20	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	3.33	3.98	4.26	4.21	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	2.88	3.88	3.97	3.82	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.47	4.00	3.69	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1131/1303	3.44	3.75	4.24	3.93	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	883/1299	4.13	3.84	4.25	3.94	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	3.36	4.01	3.80	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0301
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 329
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	1	16	4.41	700/1504	4.18	4.08	4.27	4.13	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	572/1503	4.22	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	574/1290	4.30	4.08	4.28	4.19	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	705/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.11	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	0	3	5	0	2.91	1337/1421	2.92	3.40	4.00	3.91	2.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	395/1365	3.80	3.96	4.08	3.96	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	359/1485	4.37	4.11	4.16	4.13	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	1035/1504	4.62	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	772/1483	3.98	3.76	4.06	3.97	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	700/1425	4.51	4.20	4.41	4.36	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	738/1426	4.54	4.59	4.69	4.56	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	799/1418	4.12	4.06	4.25	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	662/1416	4.41	3.98	4.26	4.21	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	386/1199	4.23	3.88	3.97	3.82	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	3	6	2	3.50	1011/1312	3.30	3.47	4.00	3.69	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	893/1303	3.86	3.75	4.24	3.93	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	904/1299	3.76	3.84	4.25	3.94	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	654/ 758	3.06	3.36	4.01	3.80	3.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 244	4.00	3.83	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	22	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 330
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	962/1504	4.18	4.08	4.27	4.13	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	816/1503	4.22	4.01	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	6	13	4.38	661/1290	4.30	4.08	4.28	4.19	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	418/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.11	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	4	3	3	3	3.07	1296/1421	2.92	3.40	4.00	3.91	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	581/1365	3.80	3.96	4.08	3.96	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	290/1485	4.37	4.11	4.16	4.13	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1112/1504	4.62	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	518/1483	3.98	3.76	4.06	3.97	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	525/1425	4.51	4.20	4.41	4.36	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	825/1426	4.54	4.59	4.69	4.56	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	848/1418	4.12	4.06	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	574/1416	4.41	3.98	4.26	4.21	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	230/1199	4.23	3.88	3.97	3.82	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1079/1312	3.30	3.47	4.00	3.69	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	887/1303	3.86	3.75	4.24	3.93	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1069/1299	3.76	3.84	4.25	3.94	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	712/ 758	3.06	3.36	4.01	3.80	2.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	145/ 244	4.00	3.83	4.09	4.07	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	35	****	4.42	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0401
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BLOCK, DAWN M
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 330
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0501
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BURT, GARY
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 331
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	1163/1504	4.18	4.08	4.27	4.13	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1110/1503	4.22	4.01	4.20	4.16	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	911/1290	4.30	4.08	4.28	4.19	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1142/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	5	3	1	2.79	1363/1421	2.92	3.40	4.00	3.91	2.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	3	1	2.73	1330/1365	3.80	3.96	4.08	3.96	2.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1110/1485	4.37	4.11	4.16	4.13	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	830/1504	4.62	4.77	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1250/1483	3.98	3.76	4.06	3.97	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	1029/1425	4.51	4.20	4.41	4.36	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	1313/1426	4.54	4.59	4.69	4.56	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1141/1418	4.12	4.06	4.25	4.20	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	921/1416	4.41	3.98	4.26	4.21	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	830/1199	4.23	3.88	3.97	3.82	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1131/1312	3.30	3.47	4.00	3.69	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1139/1303	3.86	3.75	4.24	3.93	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1106/1299	3.76	3.84	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 758	3.06	3.36	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	4.00	3.83	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.42	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CMSC 104 0501
 Title PROB SOL & COMPUTER PR
 Instructor: BURT, GARY
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 331
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0101
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 332
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	455/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	816/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	290/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	563/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	2.43	1395/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	380/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	850/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	488/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1029/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	561/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.17

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	2.50

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0102
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 333
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1092/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	649/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	832/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1391/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1146/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1030/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	709/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	921/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	820/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	530/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1076/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	190/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	106/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0103
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 334
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	851/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	816/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	615/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	331/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	2.29	1405/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	124/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1087/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	543/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	492/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	682/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	554/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	877/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1195/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1248/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	38/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	64/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 335
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1092/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1183/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1062/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1333/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1249/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1146/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	850/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	900/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	905/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	636/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1078/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	5.00	4.70	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	5.00	4.64	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	4.00	4.45	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	5.00	4.54	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	4.00	4.17	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	4.00	4.33	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	4.00	4.42	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	4.00	4.33	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	5.00	4.67	4.24	5.00	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

4 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 16 5.00 4.67 4.51 5.00 ****

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0104
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 335
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0105
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 336
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	213/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0106
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 337
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	387/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	145/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	179/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	153/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.70	4.61	4.22	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.64	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 67	4.00	4.45	4.34	4.50	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.54	4.44	4.21	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.24	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.41	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 56	4.00	4.17	4.23	4.24	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.44	4.65	4.51	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.65	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 39	4.00	4.33	4.44	4.28	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 40	4.00	4.33	4.53	4.44	4.00

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/	35	4.00	4.42	4.49	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/	36	4.00	4.33	4.60	4.13	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	20	5.00	4.67	4.24	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	16	5.00	4.67	4.51	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0106
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 337
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 338
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1092/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1052/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	937/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	745/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1013/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1195/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0202
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 339
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	168/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	618/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	758/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	680/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	2.83	1353/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	782/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	727/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	578/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	369/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1149/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1153/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1180/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	757/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	1.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	143/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	119/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	158/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	81/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	5.00	4.70	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	5.00	4.64	4.35	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	5.00	4.54	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I 0
? 0

Other

7

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0203
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 340
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1500/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1275/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	922/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0205
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 341
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1403/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1247/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	937/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1113/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1222/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1170/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1281/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	987/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1011/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1121/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	2.78	3.36	4.01	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0206
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: EVANS, SUSAN A
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 342
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	5.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0301
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 343
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1372/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1358/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1022/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	935/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1416/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	1.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1153/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	990/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	866/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1370/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	2.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1367/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1406/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	1	3	0	2.56	1390/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	2.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1373/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	2.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	3	2	1	0	2.25	1169/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	1230/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1238/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	1	2	0	2.43	1254/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	2.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	213/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	196/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	192/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	186/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	189/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	3.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0301
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 344
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1372/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1358/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1022/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	935/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1416/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	1.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1153/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	990/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	866/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	2.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	2.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	2.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	0	1	2.63	1230/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1238/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	2	1	2	0	2.43	1254/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	2.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	213/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	196/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	192/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	186/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	2	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	189/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	3.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0302
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 345
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	788/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	751/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	711/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1410/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	530/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	737/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	143/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0302
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 346
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	788/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	751/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	711/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1410/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	850/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1248/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	530/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	737/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	143/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0303
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 347
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1426/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1183/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	1254/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	2.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1282/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	1410/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1387/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1197/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	900/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1197/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	709/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1324/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	636/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	219/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	196/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	211/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0304
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 348
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	937/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	745/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	990/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	922/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 201 0305
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE I
 Instructor: FININ, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 349
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.09	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1247/1503	4.25	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1193/1290	4.21	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.42	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1379/1421	3.00	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.39	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1452/1485	4.24	4.11	4.16	4.15	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.89	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.94	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1334/1425	4.64	4.20	4.41	4.40	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1395/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1201/1418	4.45	4.06	4.25	4.22	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.22	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.17	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1011/1312	3.79	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	3.89	3.75	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	3.74	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	4.31	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 244	4.40	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.65	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.54	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 207	4.08	4.22	4.09	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0101
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 350
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	788/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1365/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	937/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1222/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1199/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	636/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1288/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1275/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	190/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	234/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	125/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	217/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	2.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0102
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 351
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1322/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1062/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1385/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1296/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1246/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1276/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	900/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	738/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1268/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	964/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1272/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1235/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1153/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	143/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	145/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	125/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	153/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0103
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 352
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1092/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1247/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	711/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	680/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1402/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	990/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1483/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1330/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1248/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	919/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0103
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 353
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1092/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1247/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	711/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	680/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1402/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	990/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0104
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 354
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	357/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	751/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	711/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	772/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	758/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	106/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.70	4.61	4.22	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.64	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.45	4.34	4.50	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.54	4.44	4.21	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.22	4.17	4.24	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.17	4.43	4.41	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.17	4.23	4.24	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.44	4.65	4.51	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.65	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.33	4.44	4.28	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.33	4.53	4.44	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.42	4.49	4.50	5.00

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	36	5.00	4.33	4.60	4.13	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	20	5.00	4.67	4.24	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	16	5.00	4.67	4.51	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0104
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 354
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0105
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 355
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	937/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1017/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	455/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1165/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1232/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1201/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	806/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1050/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	910/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	922/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	190/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	145/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	125/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	195/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0106
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 356
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	549/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1304/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1236/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1296/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	990/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1423/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1346/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1381/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1250/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1324/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	919/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1195/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	922/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 357
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	549/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1001/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1269/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	455/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	331/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	525/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	455/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	493/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	910/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	570/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	680/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	164/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	132/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	108/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	81/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	50/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0201
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 358
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	549/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1001/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1269/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	455/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	636/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	493/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	910/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	570/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	680/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	164/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	132/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	108/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	81/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	50/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0202
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 359
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	166/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	493/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	380/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	572/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	578/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	947/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	580/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	132/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	125/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	79/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0203
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 360
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	549/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	495/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	853/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1148/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1305/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	493/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	670/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	983/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	450/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	105/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	530/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	53/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0204
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 361
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	239/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	751/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	588/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	631/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1379/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1153/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	602/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	572/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	514/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	636/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	465/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	145/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	125/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	157/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	3.67
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	5.00	4.67	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0205
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 362
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	239/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	587/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	588/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	310/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1397/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	2.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	290/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	853/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	578/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	446/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	149/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1020/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1194/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	535/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	47/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	119/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 202 0206
 Title COMPUTER SCIENCE II
 Instructor: RAOUF, SAAD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 363
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	306/1504	4.45	4.08	4.27	4.26	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	618/1503	4.16	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	937/1290	4.14	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	680/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	479/1421	3.26	3.40	4.00	3.90	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	782/1365	4.09	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	727/1485	4.31	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	338/1483	3.85	3.76	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.41	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	895/1426	4.72	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	682/1418	4.24	4.06	4.25	4.22	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	380/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	271/1199	4.12	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	716/1312	3.83	3.47	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	910/1303	4.02	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	780/1299	3.97	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	387/ 758	3.03	3.36	4.01	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	4.24	3.81	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 244	4.20	3.83	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 227	4.61	4.69	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 225	4.40	3.98	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	4.37	4.22	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 364
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	15	9	3.77	1257/1504	3.37	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	8	11	13	3.91	1127/1503	3.64	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	16	4.26	783/1290	4.03	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	5	10	8	4.00	1001/1453	3.75	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	4	3	2	5	6	3.30	1222/1421	3.33	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	3	15	7	4.16	672/1365	3.87	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	26	4.71	240/1485	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	197/1504	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	8	12	6	3.79	1105/1483	3.40	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	5	2	8	18	4.00	1165/1425	3.86	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	12	17	4.29	1256/1426	4.26	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	8	13	12	3.97	1038/1418	3.54	4.06	4.25	4.22	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	10	15	4.00	1029/1416	3.63	3.98	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	3	4	12	14	4.12	587/1199	3.53	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	947/1312	3.20	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	2	7	2	4	3.53	1113/1303	3.39	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	741/1299	3.51	3.84	4.25	4.21	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	343/ 758	4.17	3.36	4.01	3.89	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.42	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0101
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: ARTOLA, PAUL
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 364
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0201
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 365
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	5	2	3.33	1403/1504	3.37	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	4	3	3.53	1294/1503	3.64	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	873/1290	4.03	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1204/1453	3.75	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1168/1421	3.33	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	603/1365	3.87	3.96	4.08	4.00	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	625/1485	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	7	3	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.40	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1205/1425	3.86	4.20	4.41	4.40	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	1313/1426	4.26	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	7	1	4	3.19	1316/1418	3.54	4.06	4.25	4.22	3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	1248/1416	3.63	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	636/1199	3.53	3.88	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1093/1312	3.20	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1145/1303	3.39	3.75	4.24	4.23	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	5	0	2	3.00	1194/1299	3.51	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	4.17	3.36	4.01	3.89	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0301
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: YESHA, YAACOV
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 366
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	1	5	4	1	2.50	1493/1504	3.37	4.08	4.27	4.26	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	3	4	3.11	1405/1503	3.64	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	8	3.72	1088/1290	4.03	4.08	4.28	4.27	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	2	3	0	3	3	3.18	1380/1453	3.75	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	1	4	1	5	3.13	1279/1421	3.33	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1133/1365	3.87	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	4	8	3.78	1164/1485	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.15	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	866/1504	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	2	5	5	1	2.94	1395/1483	3.40	3.76	4.06	4.02	2.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	3	1	7	3.35	1332/1425	3.86	4.20	4.41	4.40	3.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	1268/1426	4.26	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1272/1418	3.54	4.06	4.25	4.22	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	1285/1416	3.63	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	884/1199	3.53	3.88	3.97	3.95	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	2	0	1	2.00	1288/1312	3.20	3.47	4.00	3.98	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	5	2	0	2	1	2.20	1264/1303	3.39	3.75	4.24	4.23	2.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	1227/1299	3.51	3.84	4.25	4.21	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 758	4.17	3.36	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 203 0401
 Title DISCRETE STRUCTURES
 Instructor: EATON, ERIC R
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 367
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1219/1504	3.37	4.08	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1052/1503	3.64	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	937/1290	4.03	4.08	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	957/1453	3.75	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1144/1421	3.33	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1133/1365	3.87	3.96	4.08	4.00	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	990/1485	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1020/1483	3.40	3.76	4.06	4.02	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	1105/1425	3.86	4.20	4.41	4.40	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1183/1426	4.26	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	1	5	4	3.57	1232/1418	3.54	4.06	4.25	4.22	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	3	6	3.71	1184/1416	3.63	3.98	4.26	4.24	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1153/1199	3.53	3.88	3.97	3.95	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	826/1312	3.20	3.47	4.00	3.98	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	630/1303	3.39	3.75	4.24	4.23	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	1004/1299	3.51	3.84	4.25	4.21	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.17	3.36	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA
 Instructor: BURT, GARY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 368
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	10	2	3.76	1262/1504	3.63	4.08	4.27	4.27	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	7	1	3.18	1395/1503	3.40	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1050/1290	3.80	4.08	4.28	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1168/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1379/1421	2.97	3.40	4.00	4.01	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	782/1365	4.04	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	7	2	4	3.24	1352/1485	3.55	4.11	4.16	4.17	3.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	10	4	0	3.20	1340/1483	3.00	3.76	4.06	4.08	2.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1147/1425	4.06	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	1148/1426	4.31	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	4	5	3.71	1186/1418	3.25	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	6	4	3.82	1135/1416	3.46	3.98	4.26	4.27	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	905/1199	3.15	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1312	3.29	3.47	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1303	3.29	3.75	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1299	3.29	3.84	4.25	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	16

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0101
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 369
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	10	2	3.76	1262/1504	3.63	4.08	4.27	4.27	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	7	1	3.18	1395/1503	3.40	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1050/1290	3.80	4.08	4.28	4.31	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1168/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1379/1421	2.97	3.40	4.00	4.01	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	782/1365	4.04	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	7	2	4	3.24	1352/1485	3.55	4.11	4.16	4.17	3.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	8	1	0	2.62	1438/1483	3.00	3.76	4.06	4.08	2.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1139/1425	4.06	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1073/1426	4.31	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	2	8	0	2	2.86	1357/1418	3.25	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	1302/1416	3.46	3.98	4.26	4.27	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.15	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1312	3.29	3.47	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1303	3.29	3.75	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1299	3.29	3.84	4.25	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA
 Instructor: KATZ, HENRY S (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 370
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	7	5	3.50	1353/1504	3.63	4.08	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	4	6	3.62	1267/1503	3.40	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	1075/1290	3.80	4.08	4.28	4.31	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1001/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	1	4	4	5	3.28	1232/1421	2.97	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	742/1365	4.04	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	1116/1485	3.55	4.11	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	7	5	3	3.44	1258/1483	3.00	3.76	4.06	4.08	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	876/1425	4.06	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	1256/1426	4.31	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	7	5	5	3.43	1275/1418	3.25	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	4	7	5	3.52	1241/1416	3.46	3.98	4.26	4.27	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	4	0	1	4	2.92	1093/1199	3.15	3.88	3.97	4.02	2.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1084/1312	3.29	3.47	4.00	4.09	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1162/1303	3.29	3.75	4.24	4.27	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1162/1299	3.29	3.84	4.25	4.30	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 313 0201
 Title COMP ORGAN & ASSEMB LA
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 371
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	7	5	3.50	1353/1504	3.63	4.08	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	4	6	3.62	1267/1503	3.40	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	1075/1290	3.80	4.08	4.28	4.31	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1001/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	1	4	4	5	3.28	1232/1421	2.97	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	742/1365	4.04	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	1116/1485	3.55	4.11	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	3	2	2	3	1	2.73	1428/1483	3.00	3.76	4.06	4.08	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	1270/1425	4.06	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1345/1426	4.31	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	3	2	1	3	3.00	1330/1418	3.25	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	2	2	3	3.27	1292/1416	3.46	3.98	4.26	4.27	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	2	3	0	3	2	3.00	1050/1199	3.15	3.88	3.97	4.02	2.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1084/1312	3.29	3.47	4.00	4.09	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1162/1303	3.29	3.75	4.24	4.27	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1162/1299	3.29	3.84	4.25	4.30	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0101
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES
 Instructor: VICK, SHON
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 372
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	5	9	5	7	3.06	1445/1504	3.16	4.08	4.27	4.27	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	8	8	5	3.06	1411/1503	3.24	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	10	10	4	3.19	1221/1290	3.43	4.08	4.28	4.31	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	1	6	10	7	3.63	1245/1453	3.64	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	9	7	5	1	0	1.91	1416/1421	2.41	3.40	4.00	4.01	1.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	2	1	6	4	5	3.50	1153/1365	3.44	3.96	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	9	4	9	4	6	2.81	1418/1485	2.89	4.11	4.16	4.17	2.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	3	18	10	4.13	1368/1504	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	5	8	13	4	0	2.53	1445/1483	3.00	3.76	4.06	4.08	2.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	8	5	7	6	5	2.84	1394/1425	3.15	4.20	4.41	4.43	2.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	12	14	4.19	1292/1426	4.23	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	7	8	7	2	2.68	1377/1418	2.91	4.06	4.25	4.26	2.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	2	7	10	3	2.93	1338/1416	3.19	3.98	4.26	4.27	2.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	22	3	2	1	0	2	2.50	1138/1199	2.50	3.88	3.97	4.02	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	4	3	0	1	0	1.75	1300/1312	2.78	3.47	4.00	4.09	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1238/1303	3.68	3.75	4.24	4.27	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1187/1299	3.93	3.84	4.25	4.30	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	24	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0			
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 2	General	4	Under-grad 32 Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 8			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P	0	
			I	0	
			Other	30	
			?	2	

Course-Section: CMSC 331 0201
 Title PRIN OF PROG LANGUAGES
 Instructor: VICK, SHON
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 373
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	10	11	5	3.26	1415/1504	3.16	4.08	4.27	4.27	3.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	12	5	9	3.42	1340/1503	3.24	4.01	4.20	4.22	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	9	10	9	3.67	1109/1290	3.43	4.08	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	2	9	3	10	3.65	1233/1453	3.64	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	4	4	5	8	1	2.91	1337/1421	2.41	3.40	4.00	4.01	2.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	2	2	8	4	5	3.38	1208/1365	3.44	3.96	4.08	4.08	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	4	6	9	9	2	2.97	1396/1485	2.89	4.11	4.16	4.17	2.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	12	21	4.53	1075/1504	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	9	11	6	3.47	1250/1483	3.00	3.76	4.06	4.08	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	5	9	11	7	3.47	1314/1425	3.15	4.20	4.41	4.43	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	7	8	18	4.26	1264/1426	4.23	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	10	9	11	3	3.15	1320/1418	2.91	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	4	7	9	9	3.45	1258/1416	3.19	3.98	4.26	4.27	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	23	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	****/1199	2.50	3.88	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	870/1312	2.78	3.47	4.00	4.09	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	390/1303	3.68	3.75	4.24	4.27	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	385/1299	3.93	3.84	4.25	4.30	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	23	6	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	33	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0101
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: FREY, DENNIS
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 374
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	20	4.59	429/1504	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	219/1503	4.55	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	322/1290	4.46	4.08	4.28	4.31	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	10	15	4.41	594/1453	4.38	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	4	0	4	1	5	3.21	1252/1421	3.22	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	2	1	0	4	7	3.93	878/1365	4.13	3.96	4.08	4.08	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	270/1485	4.46	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	211/1483	4.21	3.76	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	285/1425	4.63	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	351/1426	4.73	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	191/1418	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	394/1416	4.47	3.98	4.26	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	6	9	6	3.78	805/1199	4.01	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1312	3.31	3.47	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1303	3.37	3.75	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1299	3.15	3.84	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0201
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: HOOD, DANIEL J
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 375
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	442/1504	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	190/1503	4.55	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	431/1290	4.46	4.08	4.28	4.31	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	440/1453	4.38	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	9	4	5	3.21	1256/1421	3.22	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	407/1365	4.13	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	8	19	4.52	444/1485	4.46	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	795/1504	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	119/1483	4.21	3.76	4.06	4.08	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	239/1425	4.63	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	201/1426	4.73	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	354/1418	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	268/1416	4.47	3.98	4.26	4.27	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	271/1199	4.01	3.88	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	917/1312	3.31	3.47	4.00	4.09	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	992/1303	3.37	3.75	4.24	4.27	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	996/1299	3.15	3.84	4.25	4.30	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	23				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0301
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: EDELMAN, MITCHE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 376
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	386/1504	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	414/1503	4.55	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	681/1290	4.46	4.08	4.28	4.31	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	320/1453	4.38	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	4	4	2	3	2.88	1343/1421	3.22	3.40	4.00	4.01	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	187/1365	4.13	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	433/1485	4.46	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	810/1483	4.21	3.76	4.06	4.08	4.07

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	618/1425	4.63	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	860/1426	4.73	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	790/1418	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	554/1416	4.47	3.98	4.26	4.27	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	703/1199	4.01	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.94

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	976/1312	3.31	3.47	4.00	4.09	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	910/1303	3.37	3.75	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1299	3.15	3.84	4.25	4.30	****

Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	6	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 341 0401
 Title DATA STRUCTURES
 Instructor: PENG, YUN
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 377
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1322/1504	4.35	4.08	4.27	4.27	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	990/1503	4.55	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	832/1290	4.46	4.08	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.38	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1073/1421	3.22	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1153/1365	4.13	3.96	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	938/1485	4.46	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	830/1504	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1319/1483	4.21	3.76	4.06	4.08	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1076/1425	4.63	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1248/1426	4.73	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1186/1418	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1145/1416	4.47	3.98	4.26	4.27	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	795/1199	4.01	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1233/1312	3.31	3.47	4.00	4.09	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1264/1303	3.37	3.75	4.24	4.27	2.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1256/1299	3.15	3.84	4.25	4.30	2.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I 0
? 0

Other

8

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 378
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	482/1504	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	380/1503	4.43	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	431/1290	4.10	4.08	4.28	4.31	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	240/1453	4.53	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	863/1421	3.80	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	297/1365	4.12	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	14	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	421/1483	4.16	3.76	4.06	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	285/1425	4.72	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	790/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	303/1418	4.56	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	769/1416	4.18	3.98	4.26	4.27	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	300/1199	3.97	3.88	3.97	4.02	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	632/1312	4.13	3.47	4.00	4.09	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	4.70	3.75	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	4.74	3.84	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.42	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0101
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 378
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	10	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0201
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: MITCHELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 379
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	813/1504	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	649/1503	4.43	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	6	5	7	3.67	1109/1290	4.10	4.08	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	300/1453	4.53	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	6	8	3.68	1004/1421	3.80	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	5	10	4.05	754/1365	4.12	3.96	4.08	4.08	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	591/1485	4.50	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	743/1504	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	821/1483	4.16	3.76	4.06	4.08	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	420/1425	4.72	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	926/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	745/1418	4.56	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1122/1416	4.18	3.98	4.26	4.27	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	780/1199	3.97	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	845/1312	4.13	3.47	4.00	4.09	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	4.70	3.75	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	4.74	3.84	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.33	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	1
84-150	12	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	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 345 0301
 Title SOFTWARE DESIGN/DEVELO
 Instructor: GRASSO, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 380
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1038/1504	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.27	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	805/1503	4.43	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	915/1290	4.10	4.08	4.28	4.31	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	775/1453	4.53	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	927/1421	3.80	3.40	4.00	4.01	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	3	5	3.80	967/1365	4.12	3.96	4.08	4.08	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	370/1485	4.50	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	999/1504	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.65	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	850/1483	4.16	3.76	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	688/1425	4.72	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1065/1426	4.69	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	475/1418	4.56	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	837/1416	4.18	3.98	4.26	4.27	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	884/1199	3.97	3.88	3.97	4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	530/1312	4.13	3.47	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	881/1303	4.70	3.75	4.24	4.27	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	816/1299	4.74	3.84	4.25	4.30	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 17	Non-major 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0101
 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON S
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 381
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	639/1504	4.37	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	15	4.48	525/1503	4.37	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	356/1290	4.35	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	810/1453	4.02	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	4	5	6	9	3.83	919/1421	3.76	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	430/1365	3.92	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	290/1485	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1504	4.63	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	6	12	4.20	700/1483	4.25	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	492/1425	4.67	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	643/1426	4.78	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	6	14	4.36	745/1418	4.35	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	6	13	4.20	921/1416	4.13	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	446/1199	4.10	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1312	3.20	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1303	3.10	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1299	3.10	3.84	4.25	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	2
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201
 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SIX, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 382
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	826/1504	4.37	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	848/1503	4.37	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	915/1290	4.35	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	5	3	6	3.81	1161/1453	4.02	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1004/1421	3.76	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	5	2	5	5	3.44	1181/1365	3.92	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	4	13	4.35	648/1485	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	12	7	4.25	1274/1504	4.63	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	580/1483	4.25	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	649/1425	4.67	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	878/1426	4.78	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	772/1418	4.35	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	6	8	4.06	1011/1416	4.13	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	2	3	4	8	3.89	757/1199	4.10	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1108/1312	3.20	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1191/1303	3.10	3.75	4.24	4.34	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1191/1299	3.10	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	3.36	4.01	4.17	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.42	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 411 0201
 Title COMPUTER ARCHITECTURE
 Instructor: SIX, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 382
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 383
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	522/1504	3.23	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	1052/1503	3.01	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	8	5	3.57	1138/1290	3.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1001/1453	2.66	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	815/1421	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	4	0	8	3.93	878/1365	2.96	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	4	6	7	3.75	1176/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	624/1483	2.46	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	649/1425	2.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	502/1426	3.85	4.59	4.69	4.72	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	799/1418	2.97	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	6	11	4.10	997/1416	2.22	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	4	7	5	3.83	780/1199	3.27	3.88	3.97	4.05	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	1	2	0	1	1.53	1305/1312	1.46	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	11	0	2	2	2	2.06	1274/1303	2.35	3.75	4.24	4.34	2.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	9	0	4	2	2	2.29	1260/1299	3.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	2.29
4. Were special techniques successful	4	16	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	2.25	3.36	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	1.00	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	1.00	3.83	4.09	3.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	21
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	18

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0101
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: BURT, GARY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 384
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	522/1504	3.23	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	1052/1503	3.01	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	8	5	3.57	1138/1290	3.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1001/1453	2.66	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	815/1421	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	4	0	8	3.93	878/1365	2.96	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	4	6	7	3.75	1176/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	6	2	3	0	0	1.73	1480/1483	2.46	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	7	1	0	0	2	1.90	1419/1425	2.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	1416/1426	3.85	4.59	4.69	4.72	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	6	1	2	0	1	1.90	1413/1418	2.97	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	9	0	0	0	0	1.00	1412/1416	2.22	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1190/1199	3.27	3.88	3.97	4.05	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	1	2	0	1	1.53	1305/1312	1.46	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	11	0	2	2	2	2.06	1274/1303	2.35	3.75	4.24	4.34	2.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	9	0	4	2	2	2.29	1260/1299	3.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	2.29
4. Were special techniques successful	4	16	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	2.25	3.36	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	1.00	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	1.00	3.83	4.09	3.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	18

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0201
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: BURT, GARY
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 385
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	2	2	1	4	2.56	1491/1504	3.23	4.08	4.27	4.33	2.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	6	2	1	1	2.06	1496/1503	3.01	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	4	3	2	2.75	1261/1290	3.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	3	5	0	2	2.62	1440/1453	2.66	4.08	4.21	4.22	2.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	0	0	2	4	2.83	1353/1421	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	1	3	1	1	2.17	1357/1365	2.96	3.96	4.08	4.09	2.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	8	1	2	4	3.00	1387/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	3	3	2	7	0	2.87	1497/1504	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.73	2.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	4	3	3	0	2.58	1440/1483	2.46	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	1	5	1	3	2.73	1401/1425	2.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	2.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	2	4	4	3.33	1395/1426	3.85	4.59	4.69	4.72	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	3	3	0	3	2.40	1398/1418	2.97	4.06	4.25	4.25	2.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	3	2	0	2	2.00	1401/1416	2.22	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	0	3	0	4	3.00	1050/1199	3.27	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	1	1	0	2	1.85	1296/1312	1.46	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	1	3	1	4	3.00	1195/1303	2.35	3.75	4.24	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	2	0	5	3.17	1180/1299	3.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	749/ 758	2.25	3.36	4.01	4.17	2.25
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	1.00	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.16	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0301
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: GAENG, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 386
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1481/1504	3.23	4.08	4.27	4.33	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1461/1503	3.01	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1210/1290	3.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1449/1453	2.66	4.08	4.21	4.22	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1368/1421	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1337/1365	2.96	3.96	4.08	4.09	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1434/1483	2.46	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1257/1425	2.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	2.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1395/1426	3.85	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1367/1418	2.97	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1378/1416	2.22	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.27	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1308/1312	1.46	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.35	3.75	4.24	4.34	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1078/1299	3.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	230/ 233	1.00	3.81	4.09	3.78	1.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	239/ 244	1.00	3.83	4.09	3.56	1.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	222/ 225	1.00	3.98	4.23	3.81	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0301
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: BURT, GARY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 387
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1481/1504	3.23	4.08	4.27	4.33	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1461/1503	3.01	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1210/1290	3.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1449/1453	2.66	4.08	4.21	4.22	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1368/1421	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1337/1365	2.96	3.96	4.08	4.09	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	2.46	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1367/1425	2.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	2.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	3.85	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1250/1418	2.97	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1411/1416	2.22	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	3.27	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1308/1312	1.46	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.35	3.75	4.24	4.34	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1078/1299	3.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	230/ 233	1.00	3.81	4.09	3.78	1.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	239/ 244	1.00	3.83	4.09	3.56	1.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	222/ 225	1.00	3.98	4.23	3.81	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0301
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 388
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1481/1504	3.23	4.08	4.27	4.33	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1461/1503	3.01	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1210/1290	3.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1449/1453	2.66	4.08	4.21	4.22	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1368/1421	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1337/1365	2.96	3.96	4.08	4.09	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	2.46	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1422/1425	2.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	2.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1308/1312	1.46	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.35	3.75	4.24	4.34	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1078/1299	3.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	230/ 233	1.00	3.81	4.09	3.78	1.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	239/ 244	1.00	3.83	4.09	3.56	1.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	222/ 225	1.00	3.98	4.23	3.81	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 421 0301
 Title PRINC OF OPER SYSTEMS
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 389
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1481/1504	3.23	4.08	4.27	4.33	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1461/1503	3.01	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1210/1290	3.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1449/1453	2.66	4.08	4.21	4.22	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1368/1421	3.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1337/1365	2.96	3.96	4.08	4.09	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	2.46	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1422/1425	2.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	2.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1308/1312	1.46	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.35	3.75	4.24	4.34	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1078/1299	3.20	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	230/ 233	1.00	3.81	4.09	3.78	1.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	239/ 244	1.00	3.83	4.09	3.56	1.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	222/ 225	1.00	3.98	4.23	3.81	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 435 0101
 Title COMPUTER GRAPHICS
 Instructor: JOSHI, ALARK P
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 390
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	12	4.19	832/1290	4.19	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	798/1453	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	8	6	3.70	991/1421	3.70	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	297/1365	4.50	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	380/1485	4.57	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	635/1483	4.25	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	738/1426	4.81	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	818/1418	4.29	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	2	15	4.38	769/1416	4.38	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	230/1199	4.58	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	****/1312	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1303	****	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1299	****	3.84	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 437 0101
 Title GRAPH USE INTERFACE PR
 Instructor: SQUIRE, JON
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 391
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	981/1504	4.18	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	335/1503	4.65	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	240/1290	4.76	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	396/1453	4.55	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.40	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	108/1485	4.88	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	290/1483	4.56	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	402/1425	4.76	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	301/1426	4.94	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	402/1418	4.65	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	498/1416	4.63	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	82/1199	4.88	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1303	****	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1299	****	3.84	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0101
 Title ALGORITHMS
 Instructor: COLE, FLOYD
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 392
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	5	8	6	8	3.45	1376/1504	3.34	4.08	4.27	4.33	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	7	6	6	5	2.97	1426/1503	3.04	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	7	8	3	6	5	2.79	1255/1290	2.73	4.08	4.28	4.32	2.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	4	6	3	3	4	2.85	1430/1453	2.93	4.08	4.21	4.22	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	4	5	7	9	3.63	1043/1421	3.46	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	4	4	2	4	3.00	1296/1365	2.93	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	4	6	12	3.71	1200/1485	3.47	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	460/1504	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	4	3	8	9	0	2.92	1399/1483	2.89	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	2	6	7	8	3.48	1312/1425	3.58	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	3	4	18	4.41	1197/1426	4.11	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	7	7	5	3	2.78	1364/1418	3.11	4.06	4.25	4.25	2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	3	7	4	7	3.11	1316/1416	3.21	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1121/1199	2.88	3.88	3.97	4.05	2.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1265/1312	2.49	3.47	4.00	4.07	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1195/1303	2.90	3.75	4.24	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1232/1299	3.08	3.84	4.25	4.38	2.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	3.81	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.33	4.60	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
					Major 0

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	12	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	9
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
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	26				
				?	8						

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201
 Title ALGORITHMS
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 393
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	4	5	4	3.22	1422/1504	3.34	4.08	4.27	4.33	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	7	5	2	3.11	1405/1503	3.04	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	4	6	0	2.67	1271/1290	2.73	4.08	4.28	4.32	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	2	2	4	2	3.00	1404/1453	2.93	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	2	5	4	3.29	1225/1421	3.46	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	2	3	4	2	2.87	1320/1365	2.93	3.96	4.08	4.09	2.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	1	4	3	5	3.24	1352/1485	3.47	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	691/1504	4.91	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	4	6	4	0	2.87	1407/1483	2.89	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	8	3	3.69	1274/1425	3.58	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1359/1426	4.11	4.59	4.69	4.72	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1272/1418	3.11	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	6	4	3	3.31	1285/1416	3.21	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	2	2	7	1	3.07	1045/1199	2.88	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1233/1312	2.49	3.47	4.00	4.07	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1228/1303	2.90	3.75	4.24	4.34	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1140/1299	3.08	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	4.42	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 441 0201
 Title ALGORITHMS
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 393
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 441H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 394
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.08	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.01	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	131/1290	4.90	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	140/1453	4.83	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.40	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1365	4.88	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	260/1485	4.70	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1483	5.00	3.76	4.06	4.11	5.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1425	4.90	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	407/1416	4.70	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.33

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1303	****	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	3.84	4.25	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 443 0101
 Title CRYPTOLOGY
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 395
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	752/1453	4.28	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	15	4.42	401/1421	4.42	3.40	4.00	4.02	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	5	4	9	4.05	754/1365	4.05	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	412/1485	4.54	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	1164/1504	4.42	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	506/1483	4.37	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	818/1425	4.48	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	955/1418	4.14	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	5	12	4.18	929/1416	4.18	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	3	4	7	3	3.44	946/1199	3.44	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	3.84	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	12	Under-grad	24	Non-major	0
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 446 0101
 Title DESIGN PATTERNS
 Instructor: TARR, ROBERT M
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 396
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	190/1503	4.79	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	187/1290	4.82	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	3	0	4	6	8	3.76	962/1421	3.76	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	603/1365	4.23	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	6	19	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	13	13	4.39	1179/1504	4.39	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	322/1483	4.52	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	201/1426	4.96	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	101/1418	4.92	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	198/1416	4.85	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	7	16	4.42	349/1199	4.42	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1312	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1303	****	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1299	****	3.84	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	30	Non-major	4
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 451 0101
 Title AUTOMATA THRY& FORM LA
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 397
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	9	18	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	10	19	4.57	426/1503	4.57	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	24	4.72	280/1290	4.72	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	594/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	4	5	5	8	3.65	1023/1421	3.65	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	514/1365	4.32	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	3	9	13	3.90	1086/1485	3.90	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	5	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	1	8	12	4.22	679/1483	4.22	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	10	19	4.57	712/1425	4.57	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	9	19	4.53	539/1418	4.53	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	21	4.53	593/1416	4.53	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	511/1199	4.23	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	612/1312	4.22	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	881/1303	4.11	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	634/1299	4.44	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	12	Under-grad	29	Non-major	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0101
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM
 Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 398
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	12	10	4.28	851/1504	4.28	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	10	12	4.14	954/1503	4.29	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	478/1290	4.52	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	10	13	4.31	718/1453	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	3	6	10	3.87	895/1421	3.86	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	4	5	10	4.15	681/1365	4.17	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	16	4.36	648/1485	4.25	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	891/1504	4.61	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	3	5	11	3	3.64	1183/1483	3.72	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	10	12	4.28	1015/1425	4.32	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	926/1426	4.49	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	3	7	13	4.08	990/1418	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	2	4	15	4.00	1029/1416	3.86	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	4	2	6	10	3.75	820/1199	3.71	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1312	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1303	****	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1299	****	3.84	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	28	Non-major	2
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	8	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	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 461 0201
 Title DATABASE MANGMT SYSTEM
 Instructor: MUNDUR, PADMA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 399
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	851/1504	4.28	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	618/1503	4.29	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	507/1290	4.52	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	741/1453	4.30	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	903/1421	3.86	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	654/1365	4.17	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	890/1485	4.25	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1121/1504	4.61	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1093/1483	3.72	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	951/1425	4.32	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	1256/1426	4.49	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1081/1418	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1184/1416	3.86	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	860/1199	3.71	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1312	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	3.84	4.25	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 466 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC COMMERCE TE
 Instructor: YESHA, YELENA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 400
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1481/1504	2.75	4.08	4.27	4.33	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1461/1503	2.75	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1322/1453	3.43	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1256/1421	3.20	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1116/1485	3.86	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1353/1504	4.14	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1411/1483	2.83	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1367/1425	3.00	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1256/1426	4.29	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1232/1418	3.57	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	0	2	2.71	1357/1416	2.71	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	0	0	1	3	3.14	1032/1199	3.14	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1310/1312	1.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1293/1303	1.50	3.75	4.24	4.34	1.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.50	3.84	4.25	4.38	1.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0101
 Title COMPUTER NETWORKS
 Instructor: SIDHU, DEEPIINDE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 401
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	12	7	4.04	1074/1504	3.66	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	7	6	6	3.43	1335/1503	3.19	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	8	3.87	1038/1290	3.58	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	3	6	7	3.84	1142/1453	3.34	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	5	7	7	3.81	943/1421	3.73	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	5	1	3	6	0	2.67	1337/1365	2.94	3.96	4.08	4.09	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	1	2	7	9	3.82	1140/1485	3.54	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1294/1504	4.19	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	9	8	0	3.15	1355/1483	2.98	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	10	4	3.71	1267/1425	3.75	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	790/1426	4.31	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	7	6	4	3.43	1275/1418	3.35	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	5	7	5	3.41	1268/1416	3.18	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	3	3	4	4	3	3.06	1046/1199	3.03	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.00	3.75	4.24	4.34	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1162/1299	3.29	3.84	4.25	4.38	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	16	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	23	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 481 0201
 Title COMPUTER NETWORKS
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 402
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	9	5	3	3.29	1412/1504	3.66	4.08	4.27	4.33	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	6	4	3	2.95	1428/1503	3.19	4.01	4.20	4.18	2.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	5	5	5	3.29	1205/1290	3.58	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	4	4	5	3	3	2.84	1431/1453	3.34	4.08	4.21	4.22	2.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	6	6	3.65	1023/1421	3.73	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	7	4	3	4	3.22	1256/1365	2.94	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	4	4	5	3.26	1346/1485	3.54	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	1345/1504	4.19	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	3	6	4	0	2.80	1415/1483	2.98	3.76	4.06	4.11	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	3	7	6	3.79	1250/1425	3.75	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	6	4	7	3.84	1354/1426	4.31	4.59	4.69	4.72	3.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	2	3	5	5	3.26	1306/1418	3.35	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	6	1	5	2.95	1336/1416	3.18	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	4	3	4	3	4	3.00	1050/1199	3.03	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1312	3.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1303	3.00	3.75	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1299	3.29	3.84	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

P 0
I 0
? 1

Other

7

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 491D 0101
 Title SPEC TOPIC IN COMP SCI
 Instructor: KARGUPTA, HILLO
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 403
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	250/1290	4.75	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.40	4.00	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.60	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	632/1312	4.20	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	507/1303	4.60	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.84	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 491G 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: OLANO, MARC
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 404
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.08	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	594/1453	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	679/1421	4.10	3.40	4.00	4.02	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	260/1365	4.56	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	926/1485	4.11	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	338/1483	4.50	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1057/1425	4.22	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	446/1416	4.67	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	329/1199	4.44	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.44

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	922/1312	3.71	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	737/1303	4.33	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491I 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: WAGONER, LARRY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 405
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1207/1421	3.33	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1370/1485	3.14	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1155/1504	4.43	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	3.59	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1015/1425	3.10	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.19	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	818/1418	3.41	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	727/1416	3.25	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	561/1199	3.39	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491I 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: KALPAKIS, KONST (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 406
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1207/1421	3.33	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1370/1485	3.14	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1155/1504	4.43	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1461/1483	3.59	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1415/1425	3.10	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1356/1426	4.19	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1388/1418	3.41	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1392/1416	3.25	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.39	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491I 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: STEPHENS, ARTHU (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 407
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.01	4.20	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.08	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1207/1421	3.33	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1370/1485	3.14	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1155/1504	4.43	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	850/1483	3.59	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1367/1425	3.10	4.20	4.41	4.38	3.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1296/1426	4.19	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1295/1418	3.41	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.25	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.39	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491N 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: SIVALINGAM, KRI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 408
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	556/1503	4.47	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	775/1290	4.27	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	6	6	3.93	827/1421	3.93	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	509/1485	4.47	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1121/1504	4.47	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	543/1483	4.33	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	402/1425	4.77	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	539/1418	4.54	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	407/1416	4.69	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	845/1199	3.70	3.88	3.97	4.05	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	465/1312	4.40	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	675/1303	4.40	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	504/1299	4.60	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	749/ 758	2.25	3.36	4.01	4.17	2.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 5 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4	General	Under-grad 10 Non-major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1		
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0	Electives	0
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0		

- Means there are not enough

P 0
I 0
? 0

Other

6

responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMSC 491R 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: OATES, TIMOTHY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 409
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	301/1503	4.68	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	418/1453	4.52	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	5	5	11	3.92	839/1421	3.92	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	297/1365	4.50	3.96	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	280/1485	4.68	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	11	4.46	1130/1504	4.46	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	119/1483	4.80	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	556/1425	4.68	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	366/1418	4.68	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	209/1416	4.84	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	109/1199	4.79	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	310/1312	4.58	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	268/1303	4.83	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	354/1299	4.75	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	3.36	4.01	4.17	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	4.67	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	16	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 410
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	927/1504	4.22	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	437/1503	4.56	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1131/1290	3.60	4.08	4.28	4.32	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	669/1421	4.11	3.40	4.00	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1485	4.78	4.11	4.16	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	338/1483	4.50	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.89	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	119/1199	4.78	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	652/1303	4.43	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	656/1299	4.43	3.84	4.25	4.38	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.36	4.01	4.17	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.42	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 491S 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: YOUNIS, MOHAMED
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 410
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 411
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.08	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	1014/1503	4.06	4.01	4.20	4.18	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	412/1290	4.60	4.08	4.28	4.32	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1093/1453	3.92	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	8	5	3.88	887/1421	3.88	3.40	4.00	4.02	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	2	5	3.53	1138/1365	3.53	3.96	4.08	4.09	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	2	1	2	1	6	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.11	4.16	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	726/1504	4.87	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	397/1483	4.45	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	969/1416	4.13	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	310/1199	4.47	3.88	3.97	4.05	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1312	4.88	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	227/1303	4.88	3.75	4.24	4.34	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.84	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	3.36	4.01	4.17	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.42	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: CMSC 491W 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: SEGALL, ZARY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 411
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101
 Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 412
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	826/1504	4.30	4.08	4.27	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1272/1503	3.60	4.01	4.20	4.28	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1290	4.10	4.08	4.28	4.36	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.08	4.21	4.34	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	679/1421	4.10	3.40	4.00	4.27	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	645/1365	4.20	3.96	4.08	4.35	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1265/1485	3.56	4.11	4.16	4.24	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1258/1483	3.44	3.76	4.06	4.20	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1129/1425	4.10	4.20	4.41	4.51	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1248/1426	4.30	4.59	4.69	4.80	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1186/1418	3.70	4.06	4.25	4.36	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1099/1416	3.90	3.98	4.26	4.38	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	780/1199	3.83	3.88	3.97	4.04	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.75	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.84	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	535/ 758	3.67	3.36	4.01	4.24	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	219/ 244	3.25	3.83	4.09	4.09	3.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	66/ 76	4.00	4.70	4.61	4.57	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	60/ 70	3.75	4.64	4.35	4.21	3.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	49/ 67	4.00	4.45	4.34	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	67/ 76	3.75	4.54	4.44	4.39	3.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	58/ 73	3.67	4.22	4.17	4.15	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	55/ 58	2.50	4.17	4.43	4.31	2.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	48/ 56	3.50	4.17	4.23	4.26	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	35/ 44	4.33	4.44	4.65	4.74	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.67	4.29	4.41	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	30/ 39	4.00	4.33	4.44	4.55	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	30/ 40	4.00	4.33	4.53	4.37	4.00

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	26/	35	4.25	4.42	4.49	4.46	4.25
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	29/	36	4.00	4.33	4.60	4.75	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	17/	20	4.00	4.67	4.24	3.16	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	13/	16	4.00	4.67	4.51	4.40	4.00

Course-Section: CMSC 611 0101
 Title ADV COMPUTER ARCHITECT
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 412
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 621 0101
 Title ADV OPERATING SYSTEMS
 Instructor: JOSHI, ANUPAM
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 413
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	12	10	4.28	851/1504	4.28	4.08	4.27	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	12	8	4.04	1027/1503	4.04	4.01	4.20	4.28	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	8	7	3.75	1078/1290	3.75	4.08	4.28	4.36	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	7	5	7	3.54	1270/1453	3.54	4.08	4.21	4.34	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	10	8	3.92	839/1421	3.92	3.40	4.00	4.27	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	7	7	7	3.64	1078/1365	3.64	3.96	4.08	4.35	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	12	8	4.08	948/1485	4.08	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	4.32	1228/1504	4.32	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	635/1483	4.25	3.76	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.20	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.59	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	450/1418	4.60	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	814/1416	4.32	3.98	4.26	4.38	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	6	7	6	3.57	898/1199	3.57	3.88	3.97	4.04	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	8	5	3.89	826/1312	3.89	3.47	4.00	4.31	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.75	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.84	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.36	4.01	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	13	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMSC 651 0101
 Title AUTOMATA THRY/FORML LA
 Instructor: CHANG, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 414
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	962/1504	4.20	4.08	4.27	4.44	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.01	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1062/1290	3.80	4.08	4.28	4.36	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	479/1421	4.33	3.40	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	967/1365	3.80	3.96	4.08	4.35	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	830/1485	4.20	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1093/1483	3.80	3.76	4.06	4.20	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.20	4.41	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1225/1418	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.36	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	3.98	4.26	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1138/1199	2.50	3.88	3.97	4.04	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	3.47	4.00	4.31	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	3.75	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.84	4.25	4.56	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 677 0101
 Title AGENT ARCH/MULTI-AGT S
 Instructor: DESJARDINS, MAR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 415
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	376/1504	4.65	4.08	4.27	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	633/1503	4.41	4.01	4.20	4.28	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1290	****	4.08	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	146/1453	4.82	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	119/1421	4.82	3.40	4.00	4.27	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	237/1365	4.59	3.96	4.08	4.35	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	926/1485	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1504	4.88	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	258/1483	4.60	3.76	4.06	4.20	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	456/1425	4.73	4.20	4.41	4.51	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	4	7	3.88	1112/1416	3.88	3.98	4.26	4.38	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	320/1199	4.45	3.88	3.97	4.04	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	158/1312	4.82	3.47	4.00	4.31	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.75	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.84	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	3.36	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	40/ 76	4.80	4.70	4.61	4.57	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/ 70	4.80	4.64	4.35	4.21	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 67	4.80	4.45	4.34	4.48	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	52/ 76	4.40	4.54	4.44	4.39	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	39/ 73	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.15	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 691B 0101
 Title BASIC RESRCH METHODS
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 416
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	406/1504	4.61	4.08	4.27	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.01	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	****	4.08	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	618/1453	4.39	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	571/1421	4.22	3.40	4.00	4.27	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	154/1365	4.72	3.96	4.08	4.35	4.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1047/1485	3.94	4.11	4.16	4.24	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	173/1483	4.71	3.76	4.06	4.20	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	1050/1425	4.24	4.20	4.41	4.51	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	549/1426	4.88	4.59	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	552/1418	4.53	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	740/1416	4.41	3.98	4.26	4.38	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	548/1199	4.19	3.88	3.97	4.04	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.47	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	299/1303	4.80	3.75	4.24	4.58	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	142/1299	4.93	3.84	4.25	4.56	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.36	4.01	4.24	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.70	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 70	****	4.64	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 67	****	4.45	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.54	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 73	****	4.22	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.17	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.17	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.33	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	35	****	4.42	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	36	****	4.33	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	4.67	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.67	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: CMSC 691B 0101
 Title BASIC RESRCH METHODS
 Instructor: NICHOLAS, CHARL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 416
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMSC 691M 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN COMP SC
 Instructor: SEAMAN, CAROLYN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 417
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.08	4.27	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	403/1503	4.58	4.01	4.20	4.28	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	431/1290	4.58	4.08	4.28	4.36	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	352/1453	4.58	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	212/1421	4.67	3.40	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	420/1365	4.40	3.96	4.08	4.35	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	370/1485	4.58	4.11	4.16	4.24	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.57	3.76	4.06	4.20	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.20	4.41	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.59	4.69	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	324/1416	4.75	3.98	4.26	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	247/1199	4.55	3.88	3.97	4.04	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.47	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1303	4.70	3.75	4.24	4.58	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	415/1299	4.70	3.84	4.25	4.56	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	3.36	4.01	4.24	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.81	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.83	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMSC 771 0101
 Title HEURISTIC & KNOW REPRE
 Instructor: NIRUNBERG, SERG
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 418
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	396/1504	4.63	4.08	4.27	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	972/1503	4.13	4.01	4.20	4.28	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.08	4.28	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.40	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	645/1365	4.20	3.96	4.08	4.35	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1116/1485	3.86	4.11	4.16	4.24	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	543/1483	4.33	3.76	4.06	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	876/1425	4.43	4.20	4.41	4.51	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.59	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	736/1418	4.38	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	498/1416	4.63	3.98	4.26	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	495/1199	4.25	3.88	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	530/1312	4.33	3.47	4.00	4.31	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	737/1303	4.33	3.75	4.24	4.58	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	741/1299	4.33	3.84	4.25	4.56	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.36	4.01	4.24	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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