

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101
 Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 355
 JUN 13, 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	2	5	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	3.88	4.23	4.29	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	893/1249	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1160/1424	3.80	3.82	4.21	4.28	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1396	****	3.63	3.98	3.94	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	3.78	4.07	4.05	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1228/1459	3.60	3.65	4.16	4.17	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.20	4.68	4.68	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1307/1450	3.25	3.76	4.09	4.15	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.34	4.42	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	3.82	4.26	4.29	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	3.90	4.27	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	726/1179	3.86	3.62	3.96	4.05	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.80	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1027/1259	3.80	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.68	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.75	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	155/ 246	4.00	3.74	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	216/ 249	3.33	3.25	4.11	4.32	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	242/ 242	1.33	3.50	4.40	4.63	1.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	161/ 240	4.00	3.76	4.20	4.58	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 217	****	3.91	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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	1	7	3.86	1193/1481	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.29	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	3	2	3.00	1420/1481	3.04	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	5	2	3.29	1157/1249	3.08	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	6	2	3.29	1327/1424	3.56	3.82	4.21	4.27	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	1059/1396	3.49	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	1140/1342	3.29	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	5	1	3	2.93	1400/1459	2.86	3.65	4.16	4.17	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	5	5	2	3.50	1454/1480	3.22	4.20	4.68	4.65	3.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1425/1450	2.82	3.76	4.09	4.10	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1293/1409	3.79	4.34	4.42	4.43	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	4	5	3	3.50	1372/1407	3.76	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	2	2	3.00	1325/1399	2.98	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	1	3	2.93	1330/1400	3.24	3.90	4.27	4.28	2.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	1	1	0	4	2.90	1087/1179	3.10	3.62	3.96	4.02	2.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	4	3	3.21	1089/1262	3.39	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	4	5	2	1	2.71	1217/1259	3.17	3.76	4.29	4.34	2.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	5	3	4	1	1	2.29	1237/1256	3.17	3.68	4.30	4.34	2.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	232/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.20	3.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	243/ 249	2.94	3.25	4.11	4.23	2.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	225/ 242	3.62	3.50	4.40	4.36	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	161/ 240	3.63	3.76	4.20	3.96	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	163/ 217	4.00	3.91	4.04	4.11	3.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	4.00	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****	

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	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	13	
?	4			

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	5	4	4.18	928/1481	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1380/1481	3.04	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	1	1	2.73	1221/1249	3.08	3.88	4.27	4.28	2.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	959/1424	3.56	3.82	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1167/1396	3.49	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	1248/1342	3.29	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	1	3.00	1380/1459	2.86	3.65	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	4	3	1	3.09	1466/1480	3.22	4.20	4.68	4.65	3.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	7	3	0	3.09	1344/1450	2.82	3.76	4.09	4.10	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1152/1409	3.79	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1324/1407	3.76	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	3	1	2	3.00	1325/1399	2.98	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	4	3	3.64	1193/1400	3.24	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	3	0	4	1	3.11	1035/1179	3.10	3.62	3.96	4.02	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	862/1262	3.39	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1094/1259	3.17	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1059/1256	3.17	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	144/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.20	4.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	204/ 249	2.94	3.25	4.11	4.23	3.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	213/ 242	3.62	3.50	4.40	4.36	3.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	193/ 240	3.63	3.76	4.20	3.96	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	66/ 217	4.00	3.91	4.04	4.11	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.00	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.43	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 3	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 10
				? 2	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0103
 Title: SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 358
 JUN 13, 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	3	2	7	4.00	1069/1481	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	4	4	0	2.86	1448/1481	3.04	3.88	4.23	4.23	2.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	2	6	1	3.21	1171/1249	3.08	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1303/1424	3.56	3.82	4.21	4.27	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1025/1396	3.49	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1195/1342	3.29	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	6	1	1	2.64	1421/1459	2.86	3.65	4.16	4.17	2.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	6	5	0	3.07	1466/1480	3.22	4.20	4.68	4.65	3.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1398/1450	2.82	3.76	4.09	4.10	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1228/1409	3.79	4.34	4.42	4.43	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1331/1407	3.76	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	6	3	5	0	2.93	1343/1399	2.98	3.82	4.26	4.27	2.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1301/1400	3.24	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	4	5	2	3	3.29	989/1179	3.10	3.62	3.96	4.02	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1113/1262	3.39	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1140/1259	3.17	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1099/1256	3.17	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.07	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	3	0	4	3	2	3.08	239/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.20	3.08	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	1	5	3	0	2.67	244/ 249	2.94	3.25	4.11	4.23	2.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	232/ 242	3.62	3.50	4.40	4.36	3.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	2	6	0	3	3.17	211/ 240	3.63	3.76	4.20	3.96	3.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	8	2	3.92	138/ 217	4.00	3.91	4.04	4.11	3.92	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	6	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		
			? 3	Other	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	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1193/1481	3.86	4.28	4.29	4.29	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	3	2	3.29	1378/1481	3.29	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	1	3	3.36	1144/1249	3.36	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1295/1424	3.42	3.82	4.21	4.27	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	2	2	3.14	1250/1396	3.14	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1060/1342	3.63	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	1327/1459	3.31	3.65	4.16	4.17	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1245/1480	4.21	4.20	4.68	4.65	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1262/1450	3.42	3.76	4.09	4.10	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	766/1407	4.79	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	7	1	3.54	1231/1399	3.54	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	8	2	3.62	1200/1400	3.62	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	3	6	1	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.62	3.96	4.02	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1262	****	3.80	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1259	****	3.76	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1256	****	3.68	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.75	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	208/ 246	3.57	3.74	4.20	4.20	3.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	195/ 249	3.57	3.25	4.11	4.23	3.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	210/ 242	3.86	3.50	4.40	4.36	3.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	209/ 240	3.29	3.76	4.20	3.96	3.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	193/ 217	3.14	3.91	4.04	4.11	3.14	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 1		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	13
			? 6		

Course-Section: CMPE 315 0101
 Title PRIN VLSI DESIGN
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 360
 JUN 13, 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	1	11	4.64	417/1481	4.32	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1000/1481	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	824/1249	4.32	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	406/1424	4.27	3.82	4.21	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.63	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	542/1342	4.13	3.78	4.07	4.12	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	635/1459	4.44	3.65	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.20	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	546/1450	4.17	3.76	4.09	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	588/1409	4.82	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.96	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	2	4	6	3.86	1120/1399	4.18	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	2	6	3.71	1165/1400	4.11	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	526/1179	3.32	3.62	3.96	4.02	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	862/1262	4.40	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1027/1259	3.90	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	984/1256	3.70	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 788	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	57/ 246	4.33	3.74	4.20	4.20	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	196/ 249	3.75	3.25	4.11	4.23	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	175/ 242	4.33	3.50	4.40	4.36	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	154/ 240	4.08	3.76	4.20	3.96	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	118/ 217	4.33	3.91	4.04	4.11	4.17	

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 2	General	0
84-150	6	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		
			? 2	Other	14

Course-Section: CMPE 315 0102
 Title PRIN VLSI DESIGN
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 361
 JUN 13, 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	0	1	4.00	1069/1481	4.32	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.32	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	959/1424	4.27	3.82	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.63	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	755/1342	4.13	3.78	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	460/1459	4.44	3.65	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.20	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.17	3.76	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	4.82	4.34	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.54	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.18	3.82	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.11	3.90	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1128/1179	3.32	3.62	3.96	4.02	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	4.40	3.80	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1259	3.90	3.76	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1106/1256	3.70	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.33	3.74	4.20	4.20	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	145/ 249	3.75	3.25	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	113/ 242	4.33	3.50	4.40	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	161/ 240	4.08	3.76	4.20	3.96	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	66/ 217	4.33	3.91	4.04	4.11	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	54/ 68	4.00	4.00	4.49	4.70	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 69	4.00	4.00	4.53	4.66	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	45/ 63	4.00	4.00	4.44	4.56	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	48/ 69	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.48	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	36/ 68	4.00	4.00	3.92	4.43	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 59	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.48	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 51	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.13	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.33	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	25/ 41	4.00	4.00	4.26	3.90	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	44/ 55	4.00	4.00	4.55	4.88	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.75	4.67	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	43/ 51	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.88	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	32/ 34	4.00	4.00	4.83	4.67	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 24	4.00	4.00	4.82	4.67	4.00	

Course-Section: CMPE 315 0102
 Title PRIN VLSI DESIGN
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 361
 JUN 13, 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	0	Graduate	0	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	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 320 0101
 Title PROB, STAT, & RANDOM P
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 362
 JUN 13, 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	5	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	884/1481	4.20	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	980/1249	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1424	****	3.82	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	0	2.80	1412/1459	2.80	3.65	4.16	4.17	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.20	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	3.76	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1184/1407	4.40	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	883/1399	4.20	3.82	4.26	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	985/1400	4.10	3.90	4.27	4.28	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.62	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	****	3.80	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	3.76	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	3.68	4.30	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
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: CMPE 330 0101
 Title WAVES & TRANSMISSION
 Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 363
 JUN 13, 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	1	0	0	3	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	3.82	4.21	4.27	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1207/1342	3.25	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.65	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.20	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	3.76	4.09	4.10	3.67

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.62	3.96	4.02	4.25

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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	1	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	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 416L 0101
 Title CAPSTONE COMP ENGR LAB
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 364
 JUN 13, 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	0	2	7	9	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.28	4.29	4.45	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	865/1481	4.21	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	1041/1249	3.77	3.88	4.27	4.44	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1094/1424	3.89	3.82	4.21	4.35	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	5	3	3.32	1176/1396	3.32	3.63	3.98	4.09	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	934/1342	3.83	3.78	4.07	4.21	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1250/1459	3.53	3.65	4.16	4.25	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	936/1480	4.68	4.20	4.68	4.74	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	651/1450	4.24	3.76	4.09	4.28	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	1049/1409	4.22	4.34	4.42	4.51	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	846/1399	4.24	3.82	4.26	4.36	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	7	4	3.72	1160/1400	3.72	3.90	4.27	4.38	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	651/1179	3.94	3.62	3.96	4.07	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1206/1262	2.67	3.80	4.05	4.33	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.76	4.29	4.57	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	3.68	4.30	4.60	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.75	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	212/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.45	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	245/ 249	2.60	3.25	4.11	3.87	2.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	229/ 242	3.60	3.50	4.40	4.45	3.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/ 240	****	3.76	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 217	****	3.91	4.04	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	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 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMPE 423 0101
 Title COMMUNICATION ENGNG
 Instructor: THOMAS, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 365
 JUN 13, 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	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	3.88	4.23	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	5.00	3.88	4.27	4.44	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.78	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.65	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.20	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	3.76	4.09	4.28	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.34	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	3.82	4.26	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	3.90	4.27	4.38	5.00	

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	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 650 0101
 Title DIGITAL SYSTEMS
 Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 366
 JUN 13, 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	2	9	4.46	600/1481	4.46	4.28	4.29	4.28	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	769/1481	4.31	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	893/1249	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1061/1424	3.92	3.82	4.21	4.16	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.63	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	934/1342	3.83	3.78	4.07	4.18	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	3.65	4.16	4.01	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	0	9	1	3.75	1439/1480	3.75	4.20	4.68	4.74	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	786/1450	4.09	3.76	4.09	3.96	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.34	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1019/1407	4.62	4.54	4.69	4.73	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	3.82	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	994/1400	4.08	3.90	4.27	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	563/1179	4.08	3.62	3.96	3.81	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	550/1262	4.29	3.80	4.05	4.07	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1259	4.43	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	754/1256	4.29	3.68	4.30	4.33	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	217/ 246	3.40	3.74	4.20	4.27	3.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	206/ 249	3.40	3.25	4.11	3.93	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	238/ 242	3.20	3.50	4.40	4.27	3.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.76	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	163/ 217	3.60	3.91	4.04	3.73	3.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	4.49	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 7	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 6	Non-major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMPE 691C 0101
 Title SPEC TOP IN CMPE
 Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 367
 JUN 13, 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	4	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.28	4.29	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	822/1481	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	893/1249	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	437/1424	4.50	3.82	4.21	4.16	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	584/1396	4.17	3.63	3.98	4.00	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	542/1342	4.25	3.78	4.07	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	890/1459	4.13	3.65	4.16	4.01	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.20	4.68	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	334/1450	4.50	3.76	4.09	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.34	4.42	4.36	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.54	4.69	4.73	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	713/1399	4.38	3.82	4.26	4.16	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	591/1400	4.50	3.90	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.62	3.96	3.81	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	550/1262	4.29	3.80	4.05	4.07	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	764/1259	4.29	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	658/1256	4.43	3.68	4.30	4.33	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	3.97	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	3.74	4.20	4.27	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.26	4.27	****	

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