

Course-Section: IS 101 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1013
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	11	17	7	3.56	1492/1674	3.56	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	21	12	4.10	1077/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	15	13	3.78	1162/1423	3.78	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	7	16	10	3.67	1371/1609	3.68	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	12	12	10	3.55	1193/1585	3.55	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	7	10	11	8	3.36	1349/1535	3.36	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	14	19	4.15	977/1651	4.15	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	23	17	4.43	1289/1673	4.43	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	26	6	3.95	1056/1656	3.95	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	8	27	4.63	708/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	5	10	23	4.47	1250/1585	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	10	25	4.55	578/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	2	9	23	4.34	876/1575	4.34	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	4	10	22	4.32	440/1380	4.32	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	607/1520	4.29	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	746/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	798/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	0	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	577/ 994	3.88	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: IS 101 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1013
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 5	C 11	General 9	Under-grad 41 Non-major 7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 1		

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: OZOK, ANT

Fall 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 14

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	5	6	2	3.64	1459/1674	3.64	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1097/1674	4.07	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	6	4.29	819/1423	4.29	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1405/1609	3.62	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1260/1585	3.45	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1345/1535	3.36	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	693/1586	4.64	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	903/1582	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	523/1575	4.64	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	392/1380	4.38	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	663/1520	4.23	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	914/1515	4.23	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	845/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	1	4	0	2	3.13	868/ 994	3.13	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1015
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	5	6	3	3.56	1492/1674	3.56	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	856/1674	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	943/1423	4.13	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1366/1609	3.69	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	996/1585	3.81	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	3	4	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1420/1673	4.25	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	6	1	3.46	1394/1656	3.46	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	5	2	6	3.80	1524/1585	3.80	4.72	4.69	4.60	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	8	2	3.80	1272/1582	3.80	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1010/1575	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	363/1380	4.43	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1010/1520	3.78	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1210/1511	3.78	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	811/ 994	3.33	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: IS 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO TO COMP BASED SY
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1015
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	13	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 125 0101
 Title INFO SYS LOGIC/DESIGN
 Instructor: VYAS, AMRISH J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1016
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	7	5	4.31	891/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	446/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	250/1423	4.77	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	539/1585	4.27	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	419/1651	4.58	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1484/1673	4.17	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	171/1586	4.92	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1130/1585	4.62	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	453/1575	4.69	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	234/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	454/1520	4.45	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	949/1515	4.18	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	696/1511	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	708/ 994	3.57	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: IS 125 0101
 Title INFO SYS LOGIC/DESIGN
 Instructor: VYAS, AMRISH J
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1016
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 202 0101
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO
 Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1017
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	7	10	4.17	1046/1674	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	7	3.96	1208/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	878/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1029/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	2	8	3	3	3.17	1400/1585	3.30	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	870/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	598/1651	4.54	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	693/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	763/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	1035/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	967/1582	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	949/1575	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	0	3	3	8	3.61	992/1380	4.31	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	385/1520	4.76	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	513/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	626/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: IS 202 0101
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO
 Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1017
 JAN 21, 2006
 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 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	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 17	
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 202 0201
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS METHO
 Instructor: KAHL, MARGARET
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1018
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	458/1674	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	578/1674	4.23	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.42	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	490/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1282/1585	3.30	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	481/1535	4.21	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1651	4.54	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	827/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	496/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	917/1585	4.72	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	313/1582	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	551/1575	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	4.31	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.76	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	4.82	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.76	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 247J 0101
 Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffre
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1019
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	830/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	771/1423	4.48	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.40	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	612/1585	4.10	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	131/1535	4.76	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	330/1651	4.65	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	794/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.65	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	495/1575	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1092/1520	3.42	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	3.67	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.20	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 247J 0201
 Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
 Instructor: BURALL, KYLE B
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1020
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1291/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.48	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1007/1609	4.40	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	769/1585	4.10	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1535	4.76	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1651	4.65	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	723/1586	4.65	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	1061/1582	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1289/1575	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	666/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1315/1520	3.42	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1361/1515	3.67	4.37	4.24	4.28	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1265/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	847/ 994	3.20	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	257/ 265	3.00	4.06	4.23	4.34	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	259/ 278	3.00	4.21	4.19	4.36	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	260/ 260	2.50	4.43	4.46	4.51	2.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	259/ 259	2.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	2.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	232/ 233	2.50	4.36	4.20	4.48	2.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: IS 247J 0201
 Title JAVA PROGRAMMING
 Instructor: BURALL, KYLE B
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1020
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	1	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 247S 0101
 Title PROGRAMMING IN SAS
 Instructor: FORGIONNE, GUI5
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1021
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 247V 0101
 Title SELECTED TOPICS
 Instructor: SMITH, DANA H
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1022
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	5	10	4.32	878/1674	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	1035/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	445/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	839/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	926/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	4	1	6	3.64	1218/1535	4.04	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	643/1651	4.48	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1339/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1237/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	1044/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	1392/1585	4.39	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	924/1582	4.57	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	1119/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	514/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1024/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	

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	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 247V 0201
 Title SELECTED TOPICS
 Instructor: SMITH, DANA H
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1023
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	5.00	1/1674	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	490/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	769/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	737/1535	4.04	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	966/1651	4.48	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	522/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1423/1585	4.39	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.57	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1010/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 247V 0301
 Title SELECTED TOPICS
 Instructor: TARI, FURKAN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1024
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	367/1674	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	338/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	335/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	363/1609	4.46	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	432/1585	4.09	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	643/1535	4.04	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	151/1651	4.48	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.66	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	618/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1035/1585	4.39	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1582	4.57	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	565/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	100/1380	4.62	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	760/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	788/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 2
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 295 0301
 Title INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA
 Instructor: NOORUDDIN, AAMI
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1025
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	243/1674	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1674	4.82	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	203/1423	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	242/1609	4.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	277/1585	4.76	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	169/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1182/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	207/1656	4.45	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	538/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	106/1582	4.90	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1575	4.94	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1380	4.93	3.94	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	645/1520	4.24	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	384/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	610/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 295 0401
 Title INTRO TO APPLIC PROGRA
 Instructor: NOORUDDIN, AAMI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1026
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	12	4.41	751/1674	4.61	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	325/1674	4.82	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	322/1423	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	292/1609	4.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	69/1585	4.76	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	131/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	419/1651	4.64	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1470/1673	4.36	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	805/1656	4.45	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	633/1586	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	786/1585	4.87	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	180/1582	4.90	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	203/1575	4.94	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	96/1380	4.93	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	0	10	4.23	663/1520	4.24	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	1002/1515	4.41	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	685/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	432/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 298I 0101
 Title Intro to Programming T
 Instructor: Canfield, G.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1027
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	3	3	0	3.00	1628/1674	3.54	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1653/1674	3.54	4.26	4.23	4.26	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1316/1423	3.71	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1452/1609	3.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1440/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	3.25	4.08	4.08	4.03	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1504/1651	3.92	4.20	4.18	4.20	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1169/1673	4.69	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1641/1656	3.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	2.56	1571/1586	3.60	4.43	4.43	4.48	2.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1582/1585	3.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	2.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	2	1	0	2.22	1576/1582	3.41	4.30	4.26	4.35	2.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	2	0	0	2.00	1562/1575	3.13	4.32	4.27	4.39	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1190/1380	3.81	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1513/1520	2.63	4.14	4.01	4.03	1.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	1512/1515	2.74	4.37	4.24	4.28	1.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	1491/1511	3.35	4.37	4.27	4.28	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	

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 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 298I 0201
 Title Intro to Programming T
 Instructor: Noiker, R.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1028
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	1131/1674	3.54	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	721/1674	3.54	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	968/1423	3.71	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1211/1609	3.71	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	769/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1535	3.25	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	524/1651	3.92	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	868/1673	4.69	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	794/1656	3.10	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	708/1586	3.60	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	981/1585	3.64	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1582	3.41	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	958/1575	3.13	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	348/1380	3.81	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	955/1520	2.63	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	873/1515	2.74	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	642/1511	3.35	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: IS 298I 0201
 Title Intro to Programming T
 Instructor: Noiker, R.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1028
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	11				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	903/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	554/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	404/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	629/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	326/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	467/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	795/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1470/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	507/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1034/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	917/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	313/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	265/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	635/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	603/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	618/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	148/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	

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	4	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 300 0201
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SMITH, DANA H
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1030
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	9	13	4.35	841/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	578/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	16	4.38	718/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	7	13	4.19	930/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	502/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	5	14	4.29	619/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	15	4.36	727/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	8	4.32	1368/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	744/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	816/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	1118/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	704/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	5	16	4.46	755/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	4	5	13	4.17	567/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	244/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	681/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	171/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	337/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.31	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 300 0301
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: PENTRY, PHILIP L
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1031
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	11	10	4.04	1171/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	882/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	13	8	4.00	1016/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	6	9	3.67	1377/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	5	15	4.11	692/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	8	5	10	3.81	1110/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	0	5	17	4.22	901/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	8	4.30	1390/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	10	9	2	3.62	1324/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	723/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	1309/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	956/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	915/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	7	2	3	3	4	2.74	1294/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	2.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	7	4	10	3.58	1141/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	8	4	8	1	6	2.74	1461/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	2.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	9	3	8	0	7	2.74	1467/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	2.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	19	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	795/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	4.50	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	3.75	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	4.25	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	3.75	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 49	3.50	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 61	4.50	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 50	4.60	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	4.50	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 31	4.50	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 300 0301
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: PENTRY, PHILIP L
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1031
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 300 0401
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: RADA, ROY
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1032
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	7	10	3.79	1393/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	6	13	4.07	1097/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	5	6	12	4.21	887/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	10	11	4.15	974/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	8	15	4.25	557/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	11	12	4.26	667/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	8	15	4.25	866/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	26	4.86	796/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	3	7	7	7	3.75	1237/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	6	8	8	4.00	1300/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	1374/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	6	8	7	3.83	1261/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	2	3	4	5	7	3.57	1355/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	3	3	4	8	3.65	968/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	924/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	513/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1050/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 28 Non-major 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 8	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 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 300 0501
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: HOLDEN, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1033
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	570/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	641/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	623/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	408/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	728/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	991/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	484/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1412/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	381/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	301/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	272/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	612/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	253/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	330/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	857/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	553/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	

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	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	1	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 300 8020
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1034
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	878/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	931/1674	4.35	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	845/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	743/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	360/1585	4.29	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	807/1535	4.14	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	628/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.49	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1656	4.10	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	496/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1328/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	733/1582	4.42	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	819/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	639/1380	3.96	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1002/1520	4.15	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1158/1515	4.09	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	937/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	4	0	3	2	3.33	811/ 994	3.74	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	150/ 278	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	3.91	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	49/ 99	4.50	4.36	4.39	4.29	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 97	4.80	3.76	4.14	3.48	4.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 76	4.50	3.36	3.98	4.03	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	44/ 77	3.75	3.65	3.93	3.70	3.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	39/ 53	4.25	4.19	4.45	3.87	4.25	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	33/ 48	3.75	3.86	4.12	3.67	3.75	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	40/ 49	3.50	3.74	4.27	3.27	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	26/ 61	4.50	4.03	4.09	3.20	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	3.50	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	26/ 50	4.60	4.23	4.44	3.82	4.60	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	19/ 35	4.50	4.22	4.36	3.29	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	16/ 31	4.50	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.50	

Course-Section: IS 300 8020
 Title MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEM
 Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1034
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 303 0101
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1035
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	4	8	5	3.50	1511/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	9	8	3.87	1298/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	636/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1094/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	2	5	4	6	3.40	1297/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	667/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	2	10	3.86	1258/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	778/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	7	7	1	3.50	1377/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	1191/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	7	9	4.05	1109/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	5	10	4.00	1138/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	3	2	13	4.25	489/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	3	4	1	2	2.83	1421/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1476/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	2.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1420/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	732/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 303 0101
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1035
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 303 0201
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1036
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	0	4	7	5	3.45	1528/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	8	4	3.45	1519/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	6	9	4.00	1016/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1431/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	4	2	6	3.22	1376/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	3	4	5	4	3.47	1454/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	915/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	2	3	6	1	3.14	1513/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	1	5	10	4.05	1463/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	5	8	3.85	1244/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	7	3.75	1289/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	272/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	955/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1233/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	390/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 303 0201
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, ROBERT B
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1036
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 303 0301
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, JEFFR
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1037
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	941/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	519/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	836/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	701/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	692/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	691/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	658/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	955/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	858/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	981/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	850/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	669/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	325/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	673/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1024/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	507/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	346/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 303 8020
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: DeVreis, Esther
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1038
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	406/1674	3.97	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	771/1423	4.26	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	963/1609	4.02	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	3.88	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1651	4.18	4.20	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	149/1656	3.86	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.63	4.43	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	495/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1515	3.75	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	167/ 994	4.15	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	

Course-Section: IS 303 8020
 Title HUMAN FACTORS IN COMP
 Instructor: DeVreis, Esther
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1038
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
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: IS 304 0101
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1039
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	12	4.61	471/1674	4.51	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	446/1674	4.46	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	575/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	312/1609	4.68	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	442/1585	4.54	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	4	11	4.22	703/1535	4.51	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	1	3	9	3.67	1377/1651	4.13	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	1405/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	706/1656	4.42	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	989/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	1024/1585	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	762/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	669/1575	4.51	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	770/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	338/1520	4.68	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	325/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	157/ 994	4.82	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 304 0101
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1039
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	5	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: IS 304 0201
 Title ETHICAL ISSUES IN IS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1040
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	768/1674	4.51	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	870/1674	4.46	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	697/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.68	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1585	4.54	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.51	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	393/1651	4.13	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	4.42	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.75	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	525/1582	4.51	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	692/1575	4.51	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	200/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.68	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.78	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	4.82	3.97	3.94	3.96	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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: IS 310 0101
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: REDDING, TATE
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1041
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	703/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	270/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	188/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	12	13	4.31	771/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	378/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	8	10	3.86	1057/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	186/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	13	13	4.50	381/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	86/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	366/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	423/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	200/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 11	C 1	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	28
			? 1		

Course-Section: IS 310 0201
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: GREEN, FRANK E.
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1042
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	0	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1581/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	3	3	3	2	2.86	1637/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	2.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	1340/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1439/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1023/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1317/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	6	4	2	3	3.13	1549/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	7	0	0	2.88	1584/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	1224/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	4	2	7	3.87	1513/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	3.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1348/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	1	7	3.73	1299/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	880/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	4	2	1	3	3.09	1335/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1137/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	4	1	4	3.64	1278/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	2	0	0	2	2.43	972/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	2.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
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: IS 310 0301
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: COMITZ, PAUL H.
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1043
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	2	11	16	4.25	954/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	18	4.44	689/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	9	18	4.39	718/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	8	15	4.06	1055/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	10	8	10	3.74	1058/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	7	9	10	3.63	1229/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	10	16	4.29	820/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	4.44	1278/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	9	11	4.12	882/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	389/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	397/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	438/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	23	4.55	646/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	1	9	16	4.13	594/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	751/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	847/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	594/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	396/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 8			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 32	Non-major 13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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 22		
				? 0			

Course-Section: IS 310 8020
 Title SOFTWARE/HARDWARE CNCP
 Instructor: CHIANG, CHIYUNK
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1044
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	7	4.17	1056/1674	4.03	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	1026/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	771/1423	4.19	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	743/1609	4.06	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	715/1585	4.01	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	870/1535	3.73	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	866/1651	4.12	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1470/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	3.87	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	931/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1267/1585	4.56	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	819/1582	4.35	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	819/1575	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	303/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	777/1520	3.77	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1137/1515	4.04	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	845/1511	4.17	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	474/ 994	3.54	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 325 0101
 Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC
 Instructor: FORGIONNE, GUI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1045
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	768/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	460/1674	4.48	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.58	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.17	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	413/1585	4.20	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1535	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1297/1656	3.94	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	858/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1582	4.65	4.30	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1380	4.55	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.34	****	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
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: IS 325 0201
 Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC
 Instructor: ROBINSON, RANDA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1046
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	7	3	4.09	1123/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	790/1674	4.48	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	739/1423	4.58	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	743/1609	4.17	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	769/1585	4.20	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	703/1535	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1405/1673	4.54	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	757/1656	3.94	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	882/1582	4.65	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	819/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1380	4.55	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 325 0201
 Title INTRO TO MANAGEMENT SC
 Instructor: ROBINSON, RANDA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1046
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 350 0101
 Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1047
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	5	4.33	854/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	419/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	575/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	963/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	452/1585	4.32	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1110/1535	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	471/1651	4.63	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1203/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	655/1656	4.32	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	981/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	236/1582	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	279/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	447/1380	3.90	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	572/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 350 0201
 Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffrey
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1048
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	3	4.29	916/1674	4.31	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	495/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	310/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	530/1585	4.32	4.04	3.96	3.95	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	276/1651	4.63	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1289/1673	4.46	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	615/1656	4.32	4.06	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	1224/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	737/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	438/1582	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	495/1575	4.73	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1036/1380	3.90	3.94	3.94	4.01	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: IS 350 0201
 Title BUSINESS COMM SYSTEMS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffrey
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1048
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 387 0101
 Title WEB CONTENT DEVELOPMEN
 Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1049
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1056/1674	4.17	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	845/1423	4.25	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	966/1651	4.17	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	7	1	3.58	1339/1656	3.58	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	931/1586	4.45	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	786/1585	4.82	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	589/1582	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	755/1575	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.25	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	472/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	4.01	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	322/ 994	4.33	3.97	3.94	3.96	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 403 0101
 Title USER INTERFACE DESIGN
 Instructor: GOODALL, JOHN R
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1050
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	7	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	338/1674	4.69	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	718/1423	4.38	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	889/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	896/1585	4.77	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	599/1582	4.54	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	915/1575	4.31	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	253/1380	4.58	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	4.17	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 410 0101
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: MCGINNIS, JOSEP
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1051
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	558/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	776/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	376/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	743/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	413/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	747/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	15	4.33	768/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	353/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	641/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	560/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	960/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	567/1582	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	624/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	0	5	12	4.37	406/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	901/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	778/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	553/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 410 0101
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: MCGINNIS, JOSEP
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1051
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 410 0201
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: YOON, VICTORIA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1052
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	14	10	4.31	891/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	13	9	4.19	1001/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	11	4.00	1016/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	7	9	8	3.96	1146/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	4	7	9	3.87	946/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	757/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	6	11	4.00	1097/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	0	23	4.76	944/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	10	3	3.84	1169/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	11	14	4.46	916/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	811/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	924/1582	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	975/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	385/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	810/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	857/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	955/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	346/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 410 0201
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: YOON, VICTORIA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1052
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 410 0301
 Title INTRO TO DATABASE DESI
 Instructor: Chen, Zhiyaun
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1053
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	7	4.33	854/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	830/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	575/1423	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	701/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1175/1585	3.95	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	440/1535	4.27	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	524/1651	4.28	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	4.91	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	955/1656	4.05	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	774/1586	4.59	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1387/1585	4.61	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1320/1582	4.19	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1216/1575	4.24	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	938/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	936/1520	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	707/1515	4.38	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1511	4.35	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	581/ 994	4.11	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 11
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 413 0101
 Title GUI SYSTEMS USING JAVA
 Instructor: EMURIAN, HENRY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1054
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	342/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	314/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1423	4.93	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	715/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	482/1585	4.33	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	2	4	3.29	1374/1535	3.29	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	832/1651	4.29	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	565/1673	4.93	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	131/1656	4.85	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	467/1582	4.64	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	225/1575	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	259/1520	4.71	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	242/1515	4.88	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1511	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	4.17	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C 1	General 6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 420 0101
 Title DATABASE APPL DEVELOP
 Instructor: KARABATIS, GEOR
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1055
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	214/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	292/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	335/1423	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	157/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	9	18	4.52	319/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	346/1535	4.40	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	24	4.73	254/1651	4.24	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	359/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	284/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	811/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	339/1582	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	21	4.60	579/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4	22	4.57	265/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	302/1520	4.30	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.66	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	463/1515	4.23	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	663/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	205/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General	1
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	25
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 420 0201
 Title DATABASE APPL DEVELOP
 Instructor: BANDARU, PRAKAS
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1056
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	3	7	3.83	1366/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	830/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	718/1423	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	852/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	3	6	4	3.56	1187/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	578/1535	4.40	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	768/1651	4.24	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1169/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	663/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	1158/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	632/1582	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	1090/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	549/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1169/1520	4.30	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1209/1515	4.23	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1155/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.45	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 420 8020
 Title DATABASE APPL DEVELOP
 Instructor: BANDARU, PRAKAS
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1057
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	4.50	607/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	830/1674	4.47	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	575/1423	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	963/1609	4.42	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.30	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	578/1535	4.40	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1377/1651	4.24	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	955/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1074/1586	4.62	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1354/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1025/1582	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1040/1575	4.29	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	845/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	229/1520	4.30	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.23	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	638/ 994	4.13	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 425 0101
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1058
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	1	5	14	8	3.74	1411/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	13	4.16	1026/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	6	8	12	3.87	1121/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	5	11	11	4.14	985/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	5	5	7	8	3.27	1360/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	7	7	10	3.66	1212/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.66	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	10	13	4.03	1077/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	987/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	9	9	4.00	955/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	9	14	4.33	1074/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	3	8	14	4.26	1397/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	2	9	13	4.27	924/1582	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	10	11	4.07	1111/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	2	3	6	12	3.96	718/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1043/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	930/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1030/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	652/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 425 0101
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: EVERHART, AMY
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1058
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	12	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	3
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	8	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	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: IS 425 0201
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: ZHANG, DONGSONG
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1059
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	485/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	406/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	310/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	614/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	512/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	608/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	351/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	955/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	693/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1094/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	690/1582	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	692/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	303/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	379/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	402/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	638/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.75	

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 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: IS 425 8020
 Title DECISION SUPPORT SYSTE
 Instructor: DeVreis, Esther
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1060
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1674	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	575/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1609	4.47	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1585	4.14	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1535	4.32	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	330/1651	4.45	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	832/1673	4.86	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.25	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	4.66	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1582	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1575	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	4.49	3.94	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.42	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	4.58	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	390/ 994	3.89	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 430 0101
 Title INFO SYSTEMS & SECURIT
 Instructor: DIAMOND, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1061
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	941/1674	4.27	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	705/1674	4.43	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	878/1423	4.21	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	307/1585	4.54	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1273/1535	3.55	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	832/1651	4.29	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	494/1673	4.93	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1124/1656	3.91	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	974/1586	4.43	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	599/1582	4.53	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	992/1575	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	824/1380	3.87	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	148/ 994	4.67	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4	Required for Majors 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 1
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 436 0201
 Title STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI
 Instructor: NORCIO, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1062
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	9	7	4	3.67	1449/1674	3.83	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	9	3.95	1208/1674	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	861/1423	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	1172/1609	3.90	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	8	4	3.43	1282/1585	3.34	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	5	7	6	3.95	961/1535	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	432/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	7	4.29	1397/1673	4.53	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	7	6	7	4.00	955/1656	3.70	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1250/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1166/1585	4.46	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	1181/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	1	7	7	3.89	1220/1575	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	5	2	2	4	3.07	1211/1380	3.46	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	700/1520	3.48	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	408/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	618/1511	4.02	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	600/ 994	3.83	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 436 0301
 Title STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1063
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	3	4.00	1196/1674	3.83	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1475/1674	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	894/1423	4.22	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1254/1609	3.90	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1364/1585	3.34	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1048/1535	3.91	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	1240/1651	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	929/1673	4.53	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1421/1656	3.70	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1300/1586	4.05	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1354/1585	4.46	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1228/1582	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1423/1575	3.61	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	831/1380	3.46	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1434/1520	3.48	4.14	4.01	4.18	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1209/1515	4.24	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1308/1511	4.02	4.37	4.27	4.45	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	3.83	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 436 0301
 Title STRUCT SYST ANALY/DESI
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1063
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	3	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: IS 438 0101
 Title PROJECT MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: RICHBURG, TASHA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1064
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	575/1423	4.50	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	404/1585	4.42	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	667/1535	4.25	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	419/1651	4.58	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	757/1656	4.22	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	663/1586	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	567/1380	4.17	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1520	4.71	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	266/1515	4.86	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1511	4.86	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	131/ 994	4.71	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 440 0101
 Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC
 Instructor: LEWIS, CLARENCE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1065
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1618/1674	3.90	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1535/1674	3.99	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1401/1423	2.75	4.36	4.27	4.34	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	1	3.08	1552/1609	3.97	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	4	0	2.75	1517/1585	3.75	4.04	3.96	4.01	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	2	4	0	2.78	1490/1535	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.18	2.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	3	3	0	2.55	1608/1651	3.42	4.20	4.18	4.23	2.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	868/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	1	2	3.20	1494/1656	3.68	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	1430/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1535/1585	4.35	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1464/1582	4.15	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1474/1575	4.05	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	4	1	0	1	2.25	1347/1380	3.63	3.94	3.94	4.04	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1520	4.58	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	629/1515	4.75	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	937/ 994	2.80	3.97	3.94	4.19	2.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	5.00	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	5.00	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 440 0101
 Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC
 Instructor: LEWIS, CLARENCE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1065
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	5	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 440 0201
 Title INTEG TECH BUS PROC
 Instructor: EMURIAN, HENRY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1066
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	4.71	342/1674	3.90	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	495/1674	3.99	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	2.75	4.36	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1609	3.97	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1585	3.75	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1535	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	832/1651	3.42	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1015/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	827/1656	3.68	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	4.35	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	4.35	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1582	4.15	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	4.05	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	3.63	3.94	3.94	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.58	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	4.75	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	2.80	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.39	4.41	4.42	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.65	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.15	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.36	4.39	4.57	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	3.76	4.14	4.46	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	0			

Course-Section: IS 448 0101
 Title MARKUP & SCRIPTING LAN
 Instructor: CANFIELD, GERAL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1067
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1026/1674	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1642/1674	2.80	4.26	4.23	4.31	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1413/1423	2.40	4.36	4.27	4.34	2.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1603/1609	2.50	4.23	4.22	4.30	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1297/1585	3.40	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1499/1535	2.67	4.08	4.08	4.18	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1537/1651	3.20	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	887/1673	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1592/1656	2.80	4.06	4.07	4.19	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1528/1586	3.20	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1559/1585	3.40	4.72	4.69	4.76	3.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1543/1575	2.60	4.32	4.27	4.35	2.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1311/1380	2.60	3.94	3.94	4.04	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1488/1520	2.33	4.14	4.01	4.18	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1507/1515	1.67	4.37	4.24	4.40	1.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1510/1511	1.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	1.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	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: IS 450 0101
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: MEISE, JOHN D
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1068
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	10	8	4.24	979/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1083/1674	3.95	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	750/1423	4.02	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	771/1609	4.03	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	8	3	4	3.39	1306/1585	3.52	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1092/1535	3.65	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	866/1651	4.07	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	0	18	4.70	1040/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1056/1656	3.93	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1421/1586	3.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	713/1585	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	9	4	5	3.63	1359/1582	3.69	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	793/1575	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	666/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	645/1520	4.13	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	523/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 0		

Course-Section: IS 450 0201
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffre
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1069
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	9	5	3.90	1322/1674	4.07	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	7	3.80	1340/1674	3.95	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	4	7	3.68	1203/1423	4.02	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	4	7	3.75	1320/1609	4.03	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	6	5	3.65	1128/1585	3.52	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	11	4	3	3.47	1306/1535	3.65	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	7	7	3.90	1228/1651	4.07	4.20	4.18	4.23	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	4.85	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1090/1656	3.93	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	1275/1586	3.89	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	1183/1585	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	7	5	3.75	1302/1582	3.69	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	7	6	3.75	1289/1575	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	7	3	3	3.00	1217/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	810/1520	4.13	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1197/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1050/1511	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 450 0201
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: Martens, Jeffrey
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1069
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 451 0101
 Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1070
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	751/1674	4.52	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1401/1674	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.31	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1226/1423	4.14	4.36	4.27	4.34	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1313/1609	4.26	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	557/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	945/1651	4.59	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	958/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1237/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1054/1586	4.68	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1166/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1199/1582	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1274/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	845/1380	4.35	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1210/1520	4.11	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	3	0	2	3.29	1374/1515	3.84	4.37	4.24	4.40	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1166/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 451 0101
 Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1070
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 451 0201
 Title NETWORK DESIGN & MGMT
 Instructor: GLAZER, DINA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1071
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	458/1674	4.52	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	433/1674	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1423	4.14	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.26	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.63	4.04	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1651	4.59	4.20	4.18	4.23	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	381/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1586	4.68	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1582	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1575	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	89/1380	4.35	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.11	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1515	3.84	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	358/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 451M 0201
 Title LAN MGT USING MICROSOFT
 Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1072
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	13	4.71	354/1674	4.71	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	325/1674	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	505/1423	4.56	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1377/1609	3.67	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	593/1585	4.21	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	351/1651	4.65	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1434/1673	4.24	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	912/1656	4.07	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	313/1582	4.75	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1520	4.67	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	523/1515	4.63	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1511	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	614/ 994	3.80	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 451M 0201
 Title LAN MGT USING MICROSOFT
 Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1072
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 451U 0101
 Title LAN MGMT USING UNIX
 Instructor: PELKEY, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1073
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	530/1674	4.55	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	417/1423	4.64	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	0	2	1	0	2.00	1572/1585	2.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	119/1535	4.83	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	471/1651	4.55	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.73	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	453/1575	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	463/1380	4.29	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	827/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 452C 0101
 Title
 Instructor: SHUJA, HUSSAN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1074
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	8	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	980/1674	4.21	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	750/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1355/1609	3.70	4.23	4.22	4.30	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	907/1585	3.91	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1267/1535	3.56	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1537/1673	4.08	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	1104/1586	4.31	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	798/1582	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	742/1575	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	576/1380	4.15	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	942/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.18	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	278/1511	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		10
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: IS 474 8020
 Title LEGAL ASPECTS OF IS
 Instructor: SPONAUGLE, RICH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1075
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	431/1423	4.63	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.88	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	481/1535	4.43	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	257/1656	4.67	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1380	4.86	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 498A 0101
 Title Acctg Info Systems
 Instructor: Eisenman S.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1076
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	991/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	519/1674	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1423	4.89	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.89		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1007/1609	4.13	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	326/1585	4.50	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1048/1535	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.18	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	561/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1034/1586	4.38	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	808/1582	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1080/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	143/1380	4.75	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	

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		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

Course-Section: IS 498B 0101
 Title Program for Biomed Inf
 Instructor: Liu, H.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1077
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	1	4	6	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	8	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	517/1423	4.56	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	452/1585	4.36	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	1	9	4.08	1050/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.77	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	1377/1656	3.50	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	1265/1586	4.08	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	1374/1585	4.31	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	2	6	3.62	1367/1582	3.62	4.30	4.26	4.31	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	1	7	3.77	1284/1575	3.77	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	626/1380	4.09	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	700/1520	4.20	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	944/1515	4.20	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	955/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: IS 498B 0101
 Title Program for Biomed Inf
 Instructor: Liu, H.
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1077
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	4						

Course-Section: IS 600 0101
 Title IS IMPLEMENTATION
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1078
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	2	4	1	3.44	1531/1674	3.44	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1475/1674	3.56	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1326/1423	3.29	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1377/1609	3.67	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1267/1585	3.44	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	929/1673	4.78	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1168/1586	4.22	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1354/1585	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1452/1575	3.22	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	810/1380	3.89	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1284/1520	3.25	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1267/1515	3.63	4.37	4.24	4.47	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1004/1511	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	784/ 994	3.40	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	132/ 265	4.33	4.06	4.23	4.51	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	130/ 278	4.33	4.21	4.19	4.42	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	175/ 260	4.33	4.43	4.46	4.67	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.36	4.20	4.53	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	69/ 101	4.33	4.33	4.48	4.62	4.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	62/ 95	4.00	4.15	4.31	4.43	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	3.76	4.14	4.26	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	46/ 77	3.67	3.65	3.93	4.31	3.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	35/ 53	4.33	4.19	4.45	4.64	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.21	4.26	4.59	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 50	4.33	4.23	4.44	4.64	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	21/ 35	4.33	4.22	4.36	4.84	4.33	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	18/ 31	4.33	4.25	4.34	4.64	4.33	

Course-Section: IS 600 0101
 Title IS IMPLEMENTATION
 Instructor: KORU, GUNES A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1078
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 601 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF IS
 Instructor: GUO, ZHILING
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1079
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	8	6	5	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	9	8	4.05	1118/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1341/1609	3.73	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	7	4	3.38	1306/1585	3.38	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	12	4	3.76	1140/1535	3.76	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	2	6	4	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	887/1673	4.81	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	4	7	4	3	3.21	1490/1656	3.21	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	1230/1586	4.14	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	1367/1585	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	5	7	3	3.35	1453/1582	3.35	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	5	5	3.32	1429/1575	3.32	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	4	9	5	3.71	930/1380	3.71	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	930/1520	3.89	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	847/1515	4.32	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	886/1511	4.26	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: IS 601 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF IS
 Instructor: GUO, ZHILING
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1079
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	5	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 603 0101
 Title DECISION MAKING SUPPOR
 Instructor: ZHANG, DONGSONG
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1080
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	432/1674	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	445/1423	4.61	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	799/1609	4.29	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	622/1585	4.19	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	528/1535	4.39	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	382/1651	4.61	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	207/1656	4.73	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	615/1585	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	510/1582	4.61	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	612/1380	4.12	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	529/1520	4.39	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	707/1511	4.44	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	976/ 994	2.11	3.97	3.94	4.07	2.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

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	3	9	12	4.28	916/1674	4.28	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	9	4.12	1060/1674	4.12	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	739/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	0	3	6	7	3.48	1245/1585	3.48	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	215/1535	4.70	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	1353/1656	3.56	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	4	15	4.24	1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	5	15	4.32	1361/1585	4.32	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	9	8	3.91	1208/1582	3.91	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	6	13	4.13	1070/1575	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	5	1	5	7	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	878/1520	3.95	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	966/1515	4.16	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	1144/1511	3.89	4.37	4.27	4.49	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: IS 620 0101
 Title ADV DATABASE PROJECTS
 Instructor: Chen, Zhiyaun
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1081
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 636 0101
 Title STRUC SYS ANALY & DES
 Instructor: NORCIO, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1082
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	9	4.24	979/1674	4.24	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	956/1674	4.24	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	2	7	3.81	1278/1609	3.81	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	575/1585	4.24	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	528/1535	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1188/1651	3.94	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1390/1673	4.29	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	1158/1585	4.59	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	892/1582	4.29	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	1030/1575	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1280/1380	2.80	3.94	3.94	3.85	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	379/1520	4.53	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	289/1511	4.87	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	773/ 994	3.43	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: IS 636 0101
 Title STRUC SYS ANALY & DES
 Instructor: NORCIO, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1082
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	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	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: IS 650 0101
 Title DATA COMM & NETWORKS
 Instructor: LIU, HONGFANG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1083
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	378/1585	4.44	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	154/1535	4.78	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	458/1651	4.56	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	805/1586	4.56	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	327/1575	4.78	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	817/1380	3.88	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	960/1515	4.17	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	816/1511	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	977/ 994	2.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	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	5	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	8	
?	0			

Course-Section: IS 706 0101
 Title INFO. VISUALIZATION
 Instructor: KOMLODI, ANITA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1084
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	1	2	8	2	3.64	1459/1674	3.64	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1043/1674	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	750/1423	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	879/1609	4.23	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	8	2	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	8	5	4.14	988/1651	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1093/1673	4.64	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	827/1656	4.17	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	1054/1586	4.36	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	853/1585	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1043/1582	4.14	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1060/1575	4.14	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	259/1380	4.57	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	543/1515	4.60	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	346/ 994	4.29	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: IS 707 0101
 Title INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGI
 Instructor: ZHOU, LINA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1085
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	4.15	1066/1674	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	870/1674	4.31	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	974/1423	4.08	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	974/1609	4.15	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	512/1585	4.31	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	777/1535	4.15	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1050/1651	4.08	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	826/1586	4.54	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	0	3	7	4.08	1094/1582	4.08	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	975/1575	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	635/1380	4.08	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	645/1520	4.25	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	507/1511	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	708/ 994	3.57	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: IS 731 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC COMMERCE
 Instructor: OZOK, ANT
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1086
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	7	6	5	3.62	1474/1674	3.62	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	7	4	3.43	1531/1674	3.43	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	3	1	4	6	2	3.19	1344/1423	3.19	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	10	5	3.85	1254/1609	3.85	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	2	9	2	2.95	1465/1585	2.95	4.04	3.96	4.23	2.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	8	4	2	3.31	1362/1535	3.31	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	4	8	3.76	1317/1651	3.76	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	944/1673	4.76	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	12	0	3.67	1297/1656	3.67	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1250/1586	4.11	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	1142/1585	4.60	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	7	5	3.79	1284/1582	3.79	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	5	8	4	3.63	1339/1575	3.63	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	1028/1380	3.53	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	9	4	3.83	967/1520	3.83	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	2	4	10	4.17	960/1515	4.17	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	553/1511	4.61	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 14	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 15	Under-grad 7	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	10	1	3.69	1434/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1246/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1313/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1100/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1309/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	3.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1214/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1297/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	8	1	3.62	1457/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	1258/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1336/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	8	1	3.46	1381/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	930/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	734/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	681/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	685/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	732/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	74/ 103	****	4.00	4.41	4.33	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	90/ 101	****	3.71	4.48	4.18	3.71	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	82/ 95	****	3.43	4.31	3.99	3.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	92/ 99	****	3.29	4.39	4.10	3.29	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	81/ 97	****	3.43	4.14	3.69	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	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	8	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	768/1674	****	3.99	4.27	4.07	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	542/1674	****	4.11	4.23	4.16	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	540/1423	****	4.51	4.27	4.16	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1055/1609	****	3.97	4.22	4.05	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	722/1585	****	3.78	3.96	3.88	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	631/1535	****	4.03	4.08	3.89	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	643/1651	****	3.77	4.18	4.10	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	****	4.58	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	827/1656	****	4.07	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	633/1586	****	4.34	4.43	4.37	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	640/1585	****	4.73	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	567/1582	****	4.17	4.26	4.17	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	847/1575	****	4.09	4.27	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	522/1380	****	4.17	3.94	3.78	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	397/1520	****	3.57	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	313/1515	****	3.72	4.24	3.97	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	414/1511	****	3.92	4.27	4.00	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	287/ 994	****	3.96	3.94	3.73	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.00	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	3.71	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	3.43	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	3.29	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.43	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	38/ 76	****	4.20	3.98	3.32	4.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	42/ 77	****	3.87	3.93	3.42	3.87	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	2	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	39/ 53	****	4.23	4.45	4.34	4.23	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	33/ 48	****	3.77	4.12	4.00	3.77	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	31/ 49	****	4.18	4.27	4.30	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant