

Course - Program Comparison

Data as of: 9/27/10 All ratings on 5-point scale; 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

SUS - IFSM - ASIA - Summer 2010 - Asia Session 1 - F2F

Course Rating

Questions		IFSM 201			A281		Instructor: Laurie, Robert Monroe						
		Str Disagree			Str Agree		NA	NR	Mean	STD	No.		
05	Fac well prep	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
06	Good pres	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	4.89	0.33	9		
07	Stim Intrst	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
08	Fair Grade	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	4.89	0.33	9		
09	Hlpfl Fdbck	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
10	Access	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	4.89	0.33	9		
11	Concrn	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
12	Int Chlngng	0	0	0	3	6	0	0	4.67	0.50	9		
13	Clr Obj	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	5.00	0.00	9		
14	Clr Grd Crit	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	5.00	0.00	9		
15	Valu Asgmnt	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	4.89	0.33	9		
16	Rqrd Text	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
17	Othr Crs Mtrl	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
18	Eff Use Tech	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	4.89	0.33	9		
19	Eff Writing	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	5.00	0.00	4		
20	Cmptr Skills	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	4.88	0.35	8		
21	Use Rsrch	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	4.63	0.52	8		
22	Glbl Prspctv	0	0	0	2	4	3	0	4.67	0.52	6		
23	Crit Thnkng	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	4.86	0.38	7		
24	Lab Actvty	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	4.86	0.38	7		
25	Rcmnd CORS	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
26	Rcmnd FAC	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	4.89	0.33	9		
27	Pers Goals	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	4.67	0.71	9		
28	Prof Goals	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	4.67	0.71	9		
29	Struc to Lrng	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
30	Stdnt Intract	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
31	Fac-Stud Intr	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	4.78	0.44	9		
32	Tech on Own	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	4.25	0.96	4		

Program Rating

IFSM		Str Disagree		Str Agree		NA	NR	Mean	STD	No.
0	7	11	41	49	0	0	0	4.22	0.88	108
2	7	16	35	48	0	0	0	4.11	1.01	108
2	10	18	35	43	0	0	0	3.99	1.05	108
1	1	10	43	53	0	0	0	4.35	0.77	108
1	8	10	41	48	0	0	0	4.18	0.95	108
0	4	10	46	47	0	0	0	4.27	0.78	107
0	8	17	39	42	0	0	0	4.08	0.93	106
3	8	15	41	42	0	0	0	4.02	1.04	109
2	3	8	43	53	0	0	0	4.30	0.87	109
3	4	6	39	56	0	0	0	4.31	0.94	108
2	8	16	46	37	0	0	0	3.99	0.98	109
3	6	18	44	37	0	0	0	3.98	1.00	108
3	9	14	39	32	11	0	0	3.91	1.06	97
1	7	14	36	27	23	0	0	3.95	0.96	85
3	10	18	17	21	37	0	0	3.62	1.19	69
2	6	10	42	34	13	0	0	4.06	0.96	94
1	7	13	32	29	26	0	0	3.99	0.99	82
3	10	16	20	29	29	0	0	3.79	1.19	78
2	7	16	38	29	16	0	0	3.92	1.00	92
2	4	14	35	35	17	0	0	4.08	0.96	90
4	6	15	48	35	0	0	0	3.96	1.01	108
4	9	15	38	42	0	0	0	3.97	1.10	108
3	6	22	48	28	0	0	0	3.86	0.97	107
2	5	27	45	28	0	0	0	3.86	0.93	107
2	6	20	53	28	0	0	0	3.91	0.91	109
1	6	16	54	31	0	0	0	4.00	0.86	108
1	5	27	44	30	0	0	0	3.91	0.90	107
1	1	5	34	20	3	0	0	4.16	0.78	61

Instructor Overall	4.83	0.31	4.16	0.80
Course Overall	4.81	0.28	4.00	0.80
Course Design	4.86	0.23	4.08	0.77
Pedagogy	4.80	0.26	4.06	0.83
Interaction	4.81	0.38	4.13	0.71
Course Objectives	4.77	0.28	3.99	0.92

Course - Program Comparison

Data as of: 6/1/10 All ratings on 5-point scale; 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

SUS - MATH - ASIA - Spring 2010 - Asia Session 2 - F2F

Course Rating

		MATH 107		A261		Instructor: Laurie, Robert Monroe						
Questions		Str Disagree		Str Agree		NA	NR	Mean	STD	No.		
05	Fac well prep	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	4.57	0.53	7	
06	Good pres	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	4.29	0.49	7	
07	Stim Intrst	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	4.00	0.82	7	
08	Fair Grade	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	4.57	0.53	7	
09	Hlpfl Fdbck	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	4.43	0.53	7	
10	Access	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	4.29	0.49	7	
11	Concrn	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	4.57	0.53	7	
12	Int Chlngng	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	4.43	0.79	7	
13	Clr Obj	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	4.29	0.49	7	
14	Clr Grd Crit	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	4.71	0.49	7	
15	Valu Asgmt	1	0	0	2	4	0	0	4.14	1.46	7	
16	Rqrd Text	0	1	2	1	3	0	0	3.86	1.21	7	
17	Othr Crs Mtrl	0	0	1	3	2	1	0	4.17	0.75	6	
18	Eff Use Tech	0	0	2	2	0	3	0	3.50	0.58	4	
19	Eff Writing	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	3.00	0.00	2	
20	Cmptr Skills	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	3.00	0.00	2	
21	Use Rsrch	0	1	1	1	0	4	0	3.00	1.00	3	
22	Gbl Prspctv	0	0	2	1	0	4	0	3.33	0.58	3	
23	Crit Thnkg	0	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.75	0.96	4	
24	Lab Actvty	0	0	2	1	0	3	1	3.33	0.58	3	
25	Rcmnd CORS	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	3.60	0.89	5	
26	Rcmnd FAC	0	0	4	1	1	0	1	3.50	0.84	6	
27	Pers Goals	0	0	0	3	2	0	2	4.40	0.55	5	
28	Prof Goals	0	0	1	2	2	0	2	4.20	0.84	5	
29	Struc to Lrng	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	4.00	0.71	5	
30	Stdnt Intract	0	0	2	3	1	0	1	3.83	0.75	6	
31	Fac-Stud Intr	0	0	2	4	0	0	1	3.67	0.52	6	
32	Tech on Own	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	3.67	0.58	3	

Program Rating

MATH										
Str Disagree			Str Agree		NA	NR	Mean	STD	No.	
1	1	14	35	86	0	8	4.49	0.77	137	
9	2	20	40	65	0	9	4.10	1.13	136	
5	7	19	42	62	0	10	4.10	1.07	135	
2	4	7	43	76	0	13	4.42	0.85	132	
6	4	8	45	68	0	14	4.26	1.03	131	
3	1	10	47	69	0	15	4.37	0.85	130	
2	5	19	38	67	0	14	4.24	0.95	131	
2	0	7	49	75	0	12	4.47	0.73	133	
1	0	14	49	70	0	11	4.40	0.74	134	
0	0	10	49	74	0	12	4.48	0.63	133	
5	5	9	42	72	0	12	4.29	1.01	133	
2	6	16	43	66	0	12	4.24	0.94	133	
1	6	17	39	35	29	18	4.03	0.94	98	
1	6	17	23	20	58	20	3.82	1.01	67	
2	6	14	16	13	74	20	3.63	1.11	51	
2	5	15	19	15	70	19	3.71	1.07	56	
2	6	18	16	14	69	20	3.61	1.09	56	
3	5	15	19	17	65	21	3.71	1.13	59	
1	3	17	43	52	0	29	4.22	0.86	116	
1	2	11	16	12	78	25	3.86	0.98	42	
6	6	17	50	48	0	18	4.01	1.07	127	
8	2	19	36	66	0	14	4.15	1.12	131	
5	9	15	49	46	0	21	3.98	1.07	124	
5	4	18	48	45	0	25	4.03	1.02	120	
7	5	16	53	46	0	18	3.99	1.07	127	
4	7	20	55	40	0	19	3.95	0.99	126	
5	4	19	51	48	0	18	4.05	1.01	127	
0	0	14	42	24	0	65	4.13	0.68	80	

Instructor Overall	4.29	0.46	4.24	0.85
Course Overall	3.94	0.50	4.09	0.77
Course Design	4.16	0.52	4.25	0.70
Pedagogy	4.29	0.53	4.27	0.81
Interaction	4.24	0.36	4.19	0.82
Course Objectives	3.43	0.69	3.95	0.89



Course - Program Comparison

UMUC

Course: MATH 107 Section: A261

Strong Features

"challenging" is a relative word. This course was excessive. I could not "master" any concept, the pace was too fast and too much information is given in the time. The text was not as helpful as the Math 009/0112. I like the way that text gave problems to work right with the "introductions"

None as of this moment.

Improve/Recommend

I think these courses should be longer. Most students tend to be Military members and keeping up with the assigned workload is extremely challenging, almost undoable at times. Stretching out the class would allow students more time with the material and ease the burden participation causes/can cause.

lengthen the course time or reduce required material.

None as of this moment.

Course - Program Comparison

Data as of: 6/1/10 All ratings on 5-point scale; 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

SUS - MATH - ASIA - Spring 2010 - Asia Session 2 - F2F

Course Rating

		MATH 107		A262		Instructor: Laurie, Robert Monroe						
Questions		Str Disagree		Str Agree		NA	NR	Mean	STD	No.		
05	Fac well prep	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	4.33	0.82	6	
06	Good pres	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	4.00	1.55	6	
07	Stim Intrst	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	3.83	1.60	6	
08	Fair Grade	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	4.50	0.55	6	
09	Hlpfl Fdbck	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	4.17	1.17	6	
10	Access	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	4.67	0.52	6	
11	Concrn	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	4.67	0.52	6	
12	Int Chlngng	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	4.67	0.52	6	
13	Clr Obj	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	4.67	0.52	6	
14	Clr Grd Crit	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	4.67	0.52	6	
15	Valu Asgmt	0	1	0	1	4	0	0	4.33	1.21	6	
16	Rqrd Text	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	4.00	1.10	6	
17	Othr Crs Mtrl	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	4.25	0.50	4	
18	Eff Use Tech	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	3.50	1.00	4	
19	Eff Writing	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	4.50	0.71	2	
20	Cmptr Skills	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	4.00	0.00	3	
21	Use Rsrch	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	4.33	0.58	3	
22	Gbl Prspctv	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	3.67	0.58	3	
23	Crit Thnkng	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	4.17	0.75	6	
24	Lab Actvty	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	4.00	0.00	3	
25	Rcmnd CORS	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	3.17	1.47	6	
26	Rcmnd FAC	0	1	0	1	4	0	0	4.33	1.21	6	
27	Pers Goals	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	3.83	1.17	6	
28	Prof Goals	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	4.17	1.17	6	
29	Struc to Lrng	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	3.83	1.47	6	
30	Stdnt Intract	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	4.00	0.00	6	
31	Fac-Stud Intr	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	4.33	0.52	6	
32	Tech on Own	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	3.80	0.45	5	

Program Rating

MATH										
Str Disagree			Str Agree		NA	NR	Mean	STD	No.	
1	1	14	35	86	0	8	4.49	0.77	137	
9	2	20	40	65	0	9	4.10	1.13	136	
5	7	19	42	62	0	10	4.10	1.07	135	
2	4	7	43	76	0	13	4.42	0.85	132	
6	4	8	45	68	0	14	4.26	1.03	131	
3	1	10	47	69	0	15	4.37	0.85	130	
2	5	19	38	67	0	14	4.24	0.95	131	
2	0	7	49	75	0	12	4.47	0.73	133	
1	0	14	49	70	0	11	4.40	0.74	134	
0	0	10	49	74	0	12	4.48	0.63	133	
5	5	9	42	72	0	12	4.29	1.01	133	
2	6	16	43	66	0	12	4.24	0.94	133	
1	6	17	39	35	29	18	4.03	0.94	98	
1	6	17	23	20	58	20	3.82	1.01	67	
2	6	14	16	13	74	20	3.63	1.11	51	
2	5	15	19	15	70	19	3.71	1.07	56	
2	6	18	16	14	69	20	3.61	1.09	56	
3	5	15	19	17	65	21	3.71	1.13	59	
1	3	17	43	52	0	29	4.22	0.86	116	
1	2	11	16	12	78	25	3.86	0.98	42	
6	6	17	50	48	0	18	4.01	1.07	127	
8	2	19	36	66	0	14	4.15	1.12	131	
5	9	15	49	46	0	21	3.98	1.07	124	
5	4	18	48	45	0	25	4.03	1.02	120	
7	5	16	53	46	0	18	3.99	1.07	127	
4	7	20	55	40	0	19	3.95	0.99	126	
5	4	19	51	48	0	18	4.05	1.01	127	
0	0	14	42	24	0	65	4.13	0.68	80	

Instructor Overall	4.31	0.91	4.24	0.85
Course Overall	4.14	0.66	4.09	0.77
Course Design	4.32	0.73	4.25	0.70
Pedagogy	4.23	1.06	4.27	0.81
Interaction	4.39	0.48	4.19	0.82
Course Objectives	4.06	0.69	3.95	0.89



Course - Program Comparison

UMUC

Course: MATH 107 Section: A262

Strong Features

Definitely the instructor, MR LAURIE!

There were no strong features to this course. It was absolutely horrible.

Improve/Recommend

Get an instructor who has taught this course before. I felt like a trial and error case!!!! I paid for this course and self taught throughout!!! Completely disappointing!!!

N/A

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
IFSM 310 - Term 1, 2001/02
Hardware/Software Concepts
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.78
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.89
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.89
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.89
5. The faculty member was approachable	5.00
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	5.00
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.89
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.67
9. Overall how would you rate: the course as interesting, stimulating, and challenging	5.00

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

Like the instructor was willing to review what was covered during the previous class at the beginning of the next class.

Liked class material and book.

I learned a lot but I was hoping we could learn about the way newer CPU's are built, but I was very satisfied because I got a good understanding on how the Pentium chip works.

I liked most of the class, twice a week for three hours was tough. I would like it better 5 days for 1 hour 15 minutes.

Instructor materials were more helpful then the book.

I liked the way the class was presented- Did not like the group project idea.

I enjoyed the projects, although some of the projects needed more guidance.

11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class (e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):

Made up missed classes, graded work was always returned next class.

Good

Always on time, made up canceled classes, gave us assignments to learn more about subject taught during class.

Everything was good.

Outstanding - followed the schedule yet remained flexible.

The instructor was very good about being on time, although he probably could have scheduled his breaks better.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process.

Briefly comment on the student participation in this class

(e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time,

carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):

Good

Had a great time completing assignment 5. I learned about Linux and how it works, and it was very fun being able to give a presentation to the class about what I have just learn
Participation was good.

About average for a class on a military base.

Student participation was good, except in areas where the students felt were very difficult.

13. Other comments:

Enjoyed the class, very pleased that the instructor was well versed in the material, and adept at presenting that knowledge to the class.

Good teacher and good class

See you in our next class 201.

Great Instructor: Greatly increased my knowledge of the subject.

Keep teaching in the same manner. There are many here that can benefit from your instruction.

I enjoyed the lectures, difficult material was explained in easy to understand terminology that was easy to learn.

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluations Summary
CMIS 102 - Term 1, 2001
Introduction to Programming using C++
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.67
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.67
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.56
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.67
5. The faculty member was approachable	4.67
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	4.67
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.56
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.22
9. Overall how would you rate:	4.56
a. the course as interesting, stimulating, and challenging	4.44

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

Use of PowerPoint slides for lecture as well as handouts.

Good class

I liked the programs, I just wished we had more lab time because I don't own a PC

One of the best computer classes I have taken.

I wouldn't change a thing. Really keeps you on your toes!

11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class (e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):

Very responsible

The instructor was well prepared

Outstanding, always on time and reachable after hours.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process. Briefly comment on the student participation in this class (e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time, carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):

Good class

We participated a lot

About average for a military base.

13. Other comments:

Excellent Instructor - Made class interesting and left one waiting to learn more on the subject

Last Assignment was a nightmare

More lab time hands on.

Outstanding instructor, very personable and approachable!

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
CMIS140 - Term 2, 2001/02
Intermediate C++ Programming
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.60
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.80
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.40
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.60
5. The faculty member was approachable	4.60
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	4.60
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.60
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.60
9. The course was interesting, stimulating, and challenging	4.60

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

I liked the amount of knowledge I gained.

It was challenging, but maybe too much for just 3 credits. I didn't have time for other classes.

Presentation was very clear - right up to classes. Classes could be presented in a manner that we get more time using them to better understand them.

Fellow students were willing to help each other.

**11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class
(e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):**

He was very responsible.

Mr. Laurie made sure to make up missed class days.

**12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process.
Briefly comment on the student participation in this class
(e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time, carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):**

We needed to put a lot of extra work into the class.

Many silent, but when someone spoke up, it was constructive and helpful.

13. Other comments:

Mr. Laurie is a great teacher!

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
IFSM201 - Term 2, 2001/02
Introduction to Computer Based Information Systems
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.46
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.31
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.08
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.00
5. The faculty member was approachable	4.15
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	3.77
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.23
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.00
9. The course was interesting, stimulating, and challenging	3.92

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

Using slide to teach is good.

None.

Very informative course.

He was very knowledgeable on the subject.

Classroom had too many occupants.

Overall the class was beneficial in learning the basics of computers for someone with no background like myself. A little more time spent on the basic setup of a computer would be good.
 I had fun and actually learned some new stuff.

11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class (e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):

Always on time.

Mr. Laurie was always on time and prepared. He did an outstanding job.

Great job on graded work. Always back in next class.

The instructor was very punctual.

The faculty member started class promptly.

Mr. Laurie was one of the better teachers I have had in 10 years of attending UM.

He is hard but fair.

Always on time, worked with students schedule when rescheduling class.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process. Briefly comment on the student participation in this class (e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time, carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):

Too much

Not enough, Bunch of dead heads.

Good, but some people were cheating in the class during class hours.

Class participation was high. Everyone put their "two cents" in.

We were allowed to make comments and ask ?'s all the time.

13. Other comments:

Would and will take another class with Mr. Laurie.

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
IFSM300 - Term 3, 2001/02
Management Information Systems
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.50
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.50
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.50
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.50
5. The faculty member was approachable	4.88
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	4.50
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.50
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.38
9. The course was interesting, stimulating, and challenging	4.38

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

I liked all of it.

None

Less PowerPoint Slides.

Liked project wish they were more involved.

The class should be more hands on. It was mostly terminology.

More board work and less slide presentation.

Mr. Laurie was helpful and had used PowerPoint presentations that he made to help the class.

11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class (e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):

Excellent teacher.

Flawless

Always on time.

Good

I agree with the above.

Always on time, made up cancelled classes and tried to get the students to work together in teams.

He taught well.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process. Briefly comment on the student participation in this class (e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time, carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):
Seemed we all partook into the class and gave presentations too.
 We did group project which got everyone involved.

We all did a presentation for class.

Had fun doing team projects.

Good participation.

We the students were given three projects to work on as a team and this really helped us work together.

Students were able to download PowerPoint slides from Mr Laurie's web page to help study.

13. Other comments:

See you next term.

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
CMST385 - Term 3, 2001/02
Web Site Design
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.40
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.50
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.50
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.30
5. The faculty member was approachable	4.70
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	4.40
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.40
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.10
9. The course was interesting, stimulating, and challenging	4.60

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

Liked the Lab Time. Need a little more lab time.

Sometimes very dry, always dark.

We need to work in lab more.

Like the PP slides available before class. Wish we had computers in class.

Instructor took great efforts to involve students through use of computer lab practical.

Unfortunately there were too few computers for full student participation.

Need different book - good instructor

All were good. PowerPoint handouts were great idea.

11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class (e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):

Full Extent

Class was done nicely - He was always on time, approachable, etc.

Classes held on time and full scheduled time.

Mr. Laurie was always available even to frustrated students.

The instructor did an outstanding job. I enjoyed the class very much.

Everything was on time.

Excellent.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process. Briefly comment on the student participation in this class (e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time, carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):
Seemed we all partook into the class and gave presentations too.
 Several people skipped out on final presentations

Participation very good.
Students were at all levels of expertise which added to the overall course.
Everyone worked well together.
Great.

13. Other comments:

Outstanding teacher!! Keep him here!! Students will benefit!!!
Good class.
Hated computers but have a new understanding of them and excited about website design.

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
IFSM 410 - Term 4, 2001/02
Database Management
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.29
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.00
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.14
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.29
5. The faculty member was approachable	4.43
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	4.50
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.57
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.43
9. The course was interesting, stimulating, and challenging	4.43

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

PowerPoint presentations helpful. Project should probably be required for turnin in phases
I learned that there is most to a Database than just tables.
The class was interesting and very challenging for me.
Database project was good, however it either needs to be simplified or started earlier.
We should spend more time on Access and SQL and less on Database Life cycle
Organization needs improvement, overall class was interesting.
This course requires more time.

**11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class
(e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):**

He was very responsible
Always turned back assignments quickly
Always on time, worked with students, showed more than I expected of him
when teaching Microsoft Access.
Good overall.
The faculty member made up canceled classes and went above and beyond to make sure
that we receive something out of this class.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process.

**Briefly comment on the student participation in this class
(e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time,
carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):**

Over 90% Participation
Everyone did well keeping up allowing the class to stay on schedule.
We got to show our ERD on our database project and help each other with
Relationships, Cardinality, etc.
Good participation.
Every student participated during the group work etc.

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
CMST386 - Term 4, 2001/02
Dynamic HTML
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.80
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.40
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	4.60
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.60
5. The faculty member was approachable	4.60
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	4.60
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.60
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.40
9. The course was interesting, stimulating, and challenging	4.60

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

Liked the PowerPoint Presentations and sample programs. Maybe a little more time on flow charting.
I liked the entire class.

11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class (e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):

Good job in all areas here.
The teacher was always on time.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process. Briefly comment on the student participation in this class (e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time, carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):
Seemed we all partook into the class and gave presentations too.

Students always participated.

13. Other comments:

UMUC Asian Division: Teacher Evaluation Summary
IFSM450 - Term 1, 2002/03
Data Communications and Computer Networking
Lecturer: Robert M. Laurie

Evaluation Opinion Questions

5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree	Average
1. The syllabus clearly stated course objectives and grading criteria	4.83
2. The faculty member was well-organized and prepared	4.83
3. The faculty member presents the subject matter clearly	5.00
4. The faculty member gave constructive and helpful feedback	4.67
5. The faculty member was approachable	5.00
6. The faculty member shows genuine concern for student	4.83
7. The course content added to my knowledge, ability, and skills	4.67
8. Readings from textbook were assigned to support the class	4.67
9. The course was interesting, stimulating, and challenging	4.83

Comments

10. Aspects of the class which you liked and those which you think need improvement:

None

PowerPoint slides were helpful

Great class enjoyed all of it

I liked the TCP/IP info, a lot of good info.

Teacher came prepared and used slides to aid subject matter.

Presentation slides were helpful, showed content vital to course. Flash slides very good.

11. The extent to which lecturer was responsible to the class (e.g. punctual, held class for full scheduled time, returned graded work promptly, made up canceled classes):

Very

Faculty was responsible

Full class schedule, prompt grading

Faculty member was punctual, help class for full time.

Classes were always held on time and instructor always prepared.

12. Participation of students is an integral part of the learning process. Briefly comment on the student participation in this class (e.g. completed reading prior to class, turned in assignments on time, carried their "load" in class activities and group projects):

Less than normal

Students participated frequently

All were given chance to participate. One group project.

Students carried load in class projects of activities. Turned assignments in on time.

Class members seemed genuinely interested in participating fully.

13. Other comments:

Learned a lot of good information.

Challenging course. I was not knowledgeable on most subjects taught in class. I learned a lot.

Name: Laurie , Robert
 Course: EE 3010 Section: 0A
 CRN: 10182
 Total Forms Completed: 49

MTU Student Rating of Instruction - Faculty Report
 Semester: Spring Year: 2001

SRN: 10182				Strongly			Strongly			
Total Forms Completed: 49							Disagree			
	n=	Mean	StDev	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	
1. I wanted to take this course.	49	3.29	0.95	8.2%	36.7%	32.7%	20.4%	2.0%	0.0%	
2. The pace of this course was consistent with my ability to learn.	49	4.14	0.57	24.5%	65.3%	10.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
3. Class sessions were thought provoking.	49	3.73	0.80	14.3%	53.1%	24.5%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	
4. The organization of the course helped me to learn.	49	4.02	0.74	24.5%	57.1%	14.3%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	
5. The instructors grading policies were fair.	49	4.43	0.57	46.9%	49.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
6. The instructor made students aware of his/her scheduled office hours.	49	4.39	0.56	42.9%	53.1%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
7. The instructor encouraged students to seek additional help outside of class.	49	4.33	0.65	42.9%	46.9%	10.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
8. The instructor communicated the course materials clearly.	49	4.14	0.83	36.7%	46.9%	10.2%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	
9. The instructor made students aware of the specific goals of the course.	49	4.08	0.72	28.6%	53.1%	16.3%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
10. The instructor explained the importance of what we were learning.	49	4.02	0.68	22.4%	59.2%	16.3%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
11. The instructor welcomed student questions in class.	49	4.41	0.57	44.9%	51.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
12. The instructor made connections between new material and material previously covered in class.	49	4.29	0.61	36.7%	55.1%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
13. Instructional resources (textbooks, handouts, etc.) furthered my learning.	49	3.71	0.93	18.4%	46.9%	24.5%	8.2%	2.0%	0.0%	
14. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the subject matter of the course.	48	4.33	0.72	46.9%	36.7%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	
15. The instructor used class time effectively.	49	4.22	0.58	30.6%	61.2%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
16. The instructor provided timely feedback on my work, (homework, assignments, exams, etc.).	49	4.33	0.74	46.9%	40.8%	10.2%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
17. I am more interested in the subject now than I was before I took this class.	49	3.65	0.89	10.2%	59.2%	20.4%	6.1%	4.1%	0.0%	
18. The classroom and equipment (if applicable) were adequate to support effective learning.	48	3.75	0.78	12.2%	55.1%	26.5%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	
19. Given the opportunity, I would take another course from this instructor.	49	4.18	0.90	40.8%	44.9%	8.2%	4.1%	2.0%	0.0%	
20. Taking everything into account, I consider this instructor to be an excellent teacher.	49	4.24	0.82	46.9%	32.7%	18.4%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
21. Optional Question I	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
22. Optional Question II	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
23. Optional Question III	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
24. Optional Question IV	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
25. Optional Question V	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
26. Optional Question VI	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
27. Optional Question VII	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
28. Optional Question VIII	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
29. Optional Question IX	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
30. Optional Question X	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	

Name: Laurie , Robert
 Course: EE 306 Section: R01
 CRN: 32873
 Total Forms Completed: 11

MTU Student Rating of Instruction - Faculty Report
 Quarter: Spring Year: 2000

CRN: 32873				Strongly			Strongly			
Total Forms Completed: 11				Agree-----			Disagree			
	n=	Mean	StDev	5	4	3	2	1	Omit	
1. I wanted to take this course.	11	2.82	1.27	9.1%	27.3%	18.2%	27.3%	18.2%	0.0%	
2. The pace of this course was consistent with my ability to learn.	11	4.27	0.62	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
3. Class sessions were thought provoking.	11	3.82	0.57	9.1%	63.6%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
4. The organization of the course helped me to learn.	11	4.36	0.48	36.4%	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
5. The instructors grading policies were fair.	11	4.64	0.48	63.6%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
6. The instructor made students aware of his/her scheduled office hours.	11	4.64	0.48	63.6%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
7. The instructor encouraged students to seek additional help outside of class.	11	4.64	0.48	63.6%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
8. The instructor communicated the course materials clearly.	11	4.27	0.45	27.3%	72.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
9. The instructor made students aware of the specific goals of the course.	11	4.09	0.51	18.2%	72.7%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
10. The instructor explained the importance of what we were learning.	11	4.36	0.48	36.4%	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
11. The instructor welcomed student questions in class.	11	4.64	0.48	63.6%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
12. The instructor made connections between new material and material previously covered in class.	11	4.55	0.50	54.5%	45.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
13. Instructional resources (textbooks, handouts, etc.) furthered my learning.	11	4.45	0.50	45.5%	54.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
14. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching the subject matter of the course.	11	4.36	0.64	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
15. The instructor used class time effectively.	11	4.27	0.62	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
16. The instructor provided timely feedback on my work, (homework, assignments, exams, etc.).	11	4.82	0.39	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
17. I am more interested in the subject now than I was before I took this class.	11	3.64	1.07	18.2%	45.5%	27.3%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	
18. The classroom and equipment (if applicable) were adequate to support effective learning.	10	3.90	0.54	9.1%	63.6%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	
19. Given the opportunity, I would take another course from this instructor.	11	4.27	0.62	36.4%	54.5%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
20. Taking everything into account, I consider this instructor to be an excellent teacher.	11	4.36	0.48	36.4%	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
21. Optional Question I	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
22. Optional Question II	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
23. Optional Question III	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
24. Optional Question IV	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
25. Optional Question V	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
26. Optional Question VI	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
27. Optional Question VII	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
28. Optional Question VIII	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
29. Optional Question IX	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	
30. Optional Question X	0	.	.	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	.%	