

There were: 8 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	62%	75% (3)	4	2	4.3	4.4	4.4	20% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	60% (3)	20% (1)
										Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	
2	Overall course	5	62%	100% (5)	4.6	0.5			4.2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (2)	60% (3)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
3	Course organized	5	62%	100% (5)	4.6	0.5			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (2)	60% (3)	
4	Course was intellectually challenging	5	62%	100% (5)	4.8	0.4			4.2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	
5	Work load reasonable	5	62%	100% (5)	5	0			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
6	Method of eval fair	5	62%	100% (5)	5	0			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
7	Course content helped learning	5	62%	100% (5)	4.6	0.5			4.2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (2)	60% (3)	
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	
10	Instructor communicated expectations for academic integrity	5	62%	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	62%	100% (5)	5	0		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)

12	Technology requirements clear	5	62%	100% (5)	5	0		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)
13	Instructor required resources provided accessible	5	62%	100% (5)	4.8	0.4		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	0% (0)
14	UB required software accessible	5	62%	100% (4)	5	0		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	80% (4)	20% (1)
15	UB technical support was adequate	5	62%	100% (4)	4.8	0.5		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	60% (3)	20% (1)
16	Technology easy to use	5	62%	100% (4)	4.8	0.5		5	4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	60% (3)	20% (1)
17	Technology reliable	5	62%	100% (4)	4.8	0.5		5	4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	60% (3)	20% (1)
										Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
18	Overall instructor	5	62%	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	62%	100% (5)	5	0			4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)
20	Instructor enthusiastic about teaching	5	62%	100% (5)	5	0			4.5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)
21	Instructor welcomed seeking help	5	62%	100% (5)	5	0			4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (5)	0% (0)
22	Instructor presented material clearly	5	62%	100% (5)	4.8	0.4			4.4	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	80% (4)	0% (0)
										Str Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Str Agree	N/A
24	Instructor integrated a variety of instructional method	5	62%	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	62%	100% (4)	4.8	0.5			4.3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	60% (3)	20% (1)

Instructor	Text Responses
	Question: Course element found effective
	(CSE 633LEC) class project presentation
	(CSE 633LEC) Professor was Supportive and Kind.
	(CSE 633LEC) Full independence and great support by the professor and the whole class in general.
	Question: Course improvements
	(CSE 633LEC) More lecture notes
	(CSE 633LEC) A little bit more exploration of parallel algorithms in the wild.
	Question: Effective teaching
Miller, Russ	(CSE 633LEC) Prof. Miller is very kind and helpful, gives comments on students project presentations.

Distribution of Scores

