

There were: 16 possible respondents.

	Question Text	N	RR	Top Two	Avg	SD	CSE SP22	Div SP22	Sch SP22	Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
1	Violations of academic integrity did not occur	9	56%	89% (8)	4.8	0.7	4.3	4.4	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	89% (8)	0% (0)
										V Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
2	Overall course rating	9	56%	100% (9)	4.9	0.3			4.0	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	89% (8)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
3	Course was well organized	9	56%	100% (9)	4.8	0.4			4.0	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	78% (7)	
4	Course was intellectually challenging	9	56%	100% (9)	4.8	0.4			4.1	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	22% (2)	78% (7)	
5	Work load was reasonable	9	56%	100% (9)	4.9	0.3			4.0	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	89% (8)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
6	Fair methods of evaluation	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0			4.0	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
7	Course content helped learning	9	56%	100% (9)	4.7	0.5			3.9	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (3)	67% (6)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
10	Instructor communicated expectations for academic integrity	9	56%	0% (0)	4.7	0.5				0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (3)	67% (6)	
	Follow up --									Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A

11	Online components easy to navigate	9	56%	100% (9)	4.9	0.3		5	4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)
12	Technology requirements were clear	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
13	Required resources were accessible	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
14	Required software was accessible	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
15	Technical support was adequate	9	56%	100% (8)	5	0		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	89% (8)	11% (1)
16	Technology was easy to use	9	56%	100% (9)	4.9	0.3		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	89% (8)	0% (0)
17	Technology was reliable	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
18	TAs were effective in recitation/lab and office hours	9	56%	67% (2)	4.3	1.2				0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	22% (2)	67% (6)
										V Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
20	Instructor rating	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		4.2		0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
21	Instructor clearly presented learning expectations	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		4.1		0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
22	Instructor enthusiastic about course	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		4.2		0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
23	Instructor welcomed students to seek help	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		4.2		0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
24	Instructor presented material clearly	9	56%	100% (9)	5	0		4.1		0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A

26	Instructor integrated a variety of instructional methods	7	44%	100% (7)	5	0			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (7)	0% (0)
27	Opportunities provided for instructor/student interaction	7	44%	100% (7)	5	0			4.2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (7)	0% (0)

Instructor	Text Responses
	Question: Comment on most effective elements
	(CSE 633LEC) Guest lectures by Dr. Jones were really effective and Dr. Miller's guidance throughout the course was very helpful.
	Question: Suggestions to improve course
	(CSE 633LEC) It is perfect.
	Question: Comment on teaching effectiveness
Miller, Russ	(CSE 633LEC) Dr. Miller's clear outlining of the expectations from the students taking this course is everything. He is an excellent professor, one of the very best at UB I would say.
Miller, Russ	(CSE 633LEC) Great professor with proven track record and practical knowledge to help guide the projects.

Distribution of Scores

