

There were: 24 possible respondents.

	Question Text	N	RR	Top Two	Avg	SD	CSE SP21	Div SP21	Sch SP21	Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
1	Violations of Academic Integrity did not occur	5	21%	80% (4)	4.2	1.8	4.3	4.4	4.4	20% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)
										Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
2	Overall course	5	21%	100% (5)	4.8	0.4			4.2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
3	Course organized	5	21%	100% (5)	4.8	0.4			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	
4	Course was intellectually challenging	5	21%	100% (5)	4.6	0.5			4.2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (2)	60% (3)	
5	Work load reasonable	5	21%	100% (5)	4.8	0.4			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
6	Method of eval fair	5	21%	100% (4)	5	0			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	80% (4)	20% (1)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
7	Course content helped learning	5	21%	100% (5)	4.8	0.4			4.2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
10	Instructor communicated expectations for academic integrity	5	21%	0% (0)	4.8	0.4				0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	
	Follow up --									Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
11	Online components were easy to navigate	5	21%	100% (5)	5	0		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)

12	Technology requirements clear	5	21%	80% (4)	4.6	0.9		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)
13	Instructor required resources provided accessible	5	21%	75% (3)	4.2	1.5		5	4.5	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	60% (3)	20% (1)
14	UB required software accessible	5	21%	80% (4)	4.6	0.9		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)
15	UB technical support was adequate	5	21%	67% (2)	4.3	1.2		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	40% (2)	40% (2)
16	Technology easy to use	5	21%	80% (4)	4.6	0.9		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)
17	Technology reliable	5	21%	80% (4)	4.6	0.9		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	80% (4)	0% (0)
										Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
18	Overall instructor	5	21%	100% (5)	5	0			4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
19	Instructor present learning outcomes clearly	5	21%	100% (5)	5	0			4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)
20	Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	5	21%	100% (4)	5	0			4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	80% (4)	20% (1)
21	Instructor welcomed seeking help	5	21%	80% (4)	4.4	0.9			4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	20% (1)	60% (3)	0% (0)
22	Instructor presented material clearly	5	21%	75% (3)	4.5	1			4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	0% (0)	60% (3)	20% (1)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
24	Instructor integrated a variety of instructional method	5	21%	100% (4)	4.8	0.5			4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	60% (3)	20% (1)
25	Instructor provided opportunities for a variety of interactions	5	21%	100% (5)	4.6	0.5			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (2)	60% (3)	0% (0)

Instructor	Text Responses
	Question: Course element found effective
	(CSE 410LEC) The professor is very friendly which made my learning experience much more likable
	(CSE 410LEC) I enjoyed the zybook setup.
	Question: Course improvements
	(CSE 410LEC) everything is perfect
	(CSE 410LEC) Project directives could use more structuring.
	Question: Effective teaching
Miller, Russ	(CSE 410LEC) The professor is very friendly which made my learning experience much more likable
Miller, Russ	(CSE 410LEC) Course was presented in seminar style.

Distribution of Scores

