

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101
 Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN
 Instructor: CASALE, DAVID A
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 404
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	16	4.73	361/1649	4.73	4.42	4.28	4.29	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.22	4.23	4.25	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	472/1375	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.37	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.07	4.20	4.22	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	748/1533	4.11	3.72	4.04	4.04	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1048/1512	3.87	4.08	4.10	4.14	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	683/1623	4.36	3.97	4.16	4.21	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	14	5	4.05	892/1621	4.05	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	743/1568	4.59	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	985/1572	4.73	4.76	4.70	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	715/1564	4.45	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	549/1559	4.64	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1160/1352	3.25	3.80	3.98	4.07	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	6	5	3.63	1025/1384	3.63	3.54	4.08	3.99	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1110/1382	3.74	3.93	4.29	4.19	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	998/1368	3.95	3.91	4.30	4.21	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	16	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	184/ 221	3.63	3.86	4.16	4.45	3.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	210/ 243	3.50	3.48	4.12	4.47	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	156/ 212	4.00	3.93	4.40	4.62	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	2	2	0	2	2	3.00	206/ 209	3.00	3.64	4.35	4.64	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	275/ 555	4.65	4.31	4.29	4.33	4.65	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	64/ 312	4.13	3.95	3.68	3.59	4.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 53	****	4.50	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101
 Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN
 Instructor: CASALE, DAVID A
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 404
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 306 0101
 Title INTRO CIRCUIT THEORY
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 405
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.42	4.28	4.27	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.22	4.23	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	488/1375	4.57	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.07	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.60	3.72	4.04	4.05	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	427/1623	4.57	3.97	4.16	4.08	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	748/1646	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.80	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.54	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	3.93	4.29	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.91	4.30	4.39	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.86	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.48	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	3.93	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	3.64	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.31	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		7
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		6
			? 1		
				Electives	0
				Other	4
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 406
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	5	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.42	4.28	4.27	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1504/1648	3.45	4.22	4.23	4.18	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1275/1375	3.27	4.25	4.27	4.22	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1202/1595	3.90	4.07	4.20	4.21	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1200/1533	3.57	3.72	4.04	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1055/1512	3.86	4.08	4.10	4.11	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	3	2	3.18	1501/1623	3.18	3.97	4.16	4.08	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1384/1646	4.27	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.12	4.06	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	803/1568	4.55	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.91	4.76	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1311/1564	3.73	4.35	4.28	4.25	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1079/1559	4.09	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	950/1352	3.70	3.80	3.98	3.97	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1029/1384	3.63	3.54	4.08	4.11	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	1	4	0	3.13	1306/1382	3.13	3.93	4.29	4.37	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1181/1368	3.50	3.91	4.30	4.39	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.86	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.48	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	3.93	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	3.64	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.31	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.50	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 406
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 314 0101
 Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR
 Instructor: CASALE, DAVID A
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 407
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	8	4.70	395/1649	4.70	4.42	4.28	4.27	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.22	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	853/1595	4.22	4.07	4.20	4.21	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1045/1533	3.78	3.72	4.04	4.05	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.08	4.10	4.11	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	757/1623	4.30	3.97	4.16	4.08	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	859/1621	4.10	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.76	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.80	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	3.54	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	****	3.93	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.91	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	181/ 221	3.67	3.86	4.16	4.07	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	2	1	0	2.67	234/ 243	2.67	3.48	4.12	3.89	2.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	205/ 212	3.33	3.93	4.40	4.21	3.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	205/ 209	3.17	3.64	4.35	4.12	3.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	458/ 555	3.67	4.31	4.29	4.22	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	6	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 323 0101
 Title SIGNAL/SYSTEMS THEORY
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 408
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	14	4.63	471/1649	4.63	4.42	4.28	4.27	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	672/1648	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.18	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	797/1375	4.26	4.25	4.27	4.22	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	782/1595	4.29	4.07	4.20	4.21	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	5	5	3.53	1235/1533	3.53	3.72	4.04	4.05	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1082/1512	3.81	4.08	4.10	4.11	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1134/1623	3.94	3.97	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	571/1621	4.35	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	461/1568	4.76	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.76	4.70	4.64	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	498/1564	4.65	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	536/1559	4.65	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	7	4	5	3.76	907/1352	3.76	3.80	3.98	3.97	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	4	1	2	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	3.54	4.08	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1310/1382	3.09	3.93	4.29	4.37	3.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	6	0	3	3.27	1247/1368	3.27	3.91	4.30	4.39	3.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.00	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMPE 415 0101
 Title PROGRAM LOGIC DEVICES
 Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 409
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	7	8	4.22	996/1649	4.22	4.42	4.28	4.50	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.36	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	617/1375	4.44	4.25	4.27	4.48	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	1027/1595	4.07	4.07	4.20	4.36	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	3.72	4.04	4.14	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	564/1512	4.36	4.08	4.10	4.26	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	8	6	3.94	1119/1623	3.94	3.97	4.16	4.27	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	799/1646	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.71	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	11	2	3.94	1016/1621	3.94	4.12	4.06	4.24	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	827/1568	4.53	4.56	4.43	4.54	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	1352/1572	4.35	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	1019/1564	4.18	4.35	4.28	4.40	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1098/1559	4.06	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	650/1352	4.08	3.80	3.98	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1384	****	3.54	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1382	****	3.93	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1368	****	3.91	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.31	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: CMPE 419 0101
 Title COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 410
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	6	3	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.42	4.28	4.50	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.22	4.23	4.36	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	505/1375	4.56	4.25	4.27	4.48	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.07	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1200/1533	3.57	3.72	4.04	4.14	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1055/1512	3.86	4.08	4.10	4.26	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	936/1623	4.14	3.97	4.16	4.27	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	456/1621	4.44	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.56	4.43	4.54	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	600/1564	4.56	4.35	4.28	4.40	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	836/1352	3.88	3.80	3.98	4.07	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	737/1384	4.14	3.54	4.08	4.35	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	3.93	4.29	4.56	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	827/1368	4.29	3.91	4.30	4.58	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 3	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: CMPE 423 0101
 Title COMMUNICATION ENGNG
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 411
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.42	4.28	4.50	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.22	4.23	4.36	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.25	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.07	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	3.72	4.04	4.14	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.97	4.16	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.12	4.06	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.56	4.43	4.54	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.80	3.98	4.07	5.00

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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

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	3	9	8	4.25	965/1649	4.25	4.42	4.28	4.50	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1176/1648	3.95	4.22	4.23	4.36	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	505/1375	4.56	4.25	4.27	4.48	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	2	5	9	4.05	1038/1595	4.05	4.07	4.20	4.36	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	7	3	3.33	1338/1533	3.33	3.72	4.04	4.14	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	7	6	3.57	1221/1512	3.57	4.08	4.10	4.26	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	4	6	3	2	3.06	1527/1623	3.06	3.97	4.16	4.27	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.71	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	571/1621	4.35	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.56	4.43	4.54	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	1003/1572	4.71	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	754/1564	4.42	4.35	4.28	4.40	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	1079/1559	4.10	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.80	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	987/1384	3.71	3.54	4.08	4.35	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	899/1382	4.14	3.93	4.29	4.56	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.91	4.30	4.58	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	124/ 221	4.14	3.86	4.16	4.73	4.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	190/ 243	3.73	3.48	4.12	4.61	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	122/ 212	4.40	3.93	4.40	4.57	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	116/ 209	4.40	3.64	4.35	4.63	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	6	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	323/ 555	4.40	4.31	4.29	4.41	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.95	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	20

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CMPE 641 0101
 Title TOPICS IN VLSI
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 413
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.42	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1208/1375	3.50	4.25	4.27	4.44	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.07	4.20	4.35	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1249/1533	3.50	3.72	4.04	4.28	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.08	4.10	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	915/1623	4.17	3.97	4.16	4.29	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.75	4.69	4.81	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1050/1568	4.33	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.76	4.70	4.83	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1028/1564	4.17	4.35	4.28	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	914/1352	3.75	3.80	3.98	4.10	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1159/1384	3.33	3.54	4.08	4.30	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	3.93	4.29	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.91	4.30	4.56	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	129/ 221	4.00	3.86	4.16	4.27	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	3.48	4.12	4.61	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	156/ 212	4.00	3.93	4.40	4.73	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	151/ 209	4.00	3.64	4.35	4.80	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.66	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 53	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.37	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	18/ 30	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.49	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	39/ 41	3.50	3.50	4.43	4.43	3.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 5	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 1	Non-major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	0			

Course-Section: CMPE 691M 0101
 Title ANALOG & MIXED SIGNAL
 Instructor: ROBUCCI, RYAN W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 414
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	0	2	2	5	5	5	3.47	1505/1649	3.47	4.42	4.28	4.46	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	7	6	3	3.42	1517/1648	3.42	4.22	4.23	4.34	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	10	5	3	3.47	1218/1375	3.47	4.25	4.27	4.44	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	6	6	4	3.61	1365/1595	3.61	4.07	4.20	4.35	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	2	5	4	3.47	1276/1533	3.47	3.72	4.04	4.28	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	7	4	3.58	1221/1512	3.58	4.08	4.10	4.35	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.97	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	1015/1646	4.68	4.75	4.69	4.81	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	3	1	6	4	1	2.93	1525/1621	2.93	4.12	4.06	4.20	2.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	5	5	6	3.63	1433/1568	3.63	4.56	4.43	4.52	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	1222/1572	4.53	4.76	4.70	4.83	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	7	3	3	3.05	1492/1564	3.05	4.35	4.28	4.41	3.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	6	2	6	3.37	1417/1559	3.37	4.36	4.29	4.41	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	2	2	1	3	3.33	1130/1352	3.33	3.80	3.98	4.10	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	3	3	1	2.83	1309/1384	2.83	3.54	4.08	4.30	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	4	3	0	5	3.50	1216/1382	3.50	3.93	4.29	4.52	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	4	1	5	3.75	1095/1368	3.75	3.91	4.30	4.56	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	3.86	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	3.48	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	3.93	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	3.64	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	374/ 555	4.14	4.31	4.29	4.66	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	3	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	189/ 312	3.78	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.78	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	7	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						