

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101
 Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 307
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	8	2	5	3.24	1420/1504	3.24	4.46	4.27	4.26	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	4	3	3	2.67	1472/1503	2.67	4.15	4.20	4.18	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	5	4	2	2	2.29	1282/1290	2.29	3.92	4.28	4.27	2.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	5	6	3	1	1	2.19	1447/1453	2.19	4.11	4.21	4.20	2.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	8	4	2	0	1	1.80	1419/1421	1.80	3.87	4.00	3.90	1.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	3	6	2	1	2.47	1349/1365	2.47	3.92	4.08	4.00	2.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	5	3	3	2.76	1425/1485	2.76	4.00	4.16	4.15	2.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	329/1504	4.95	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	12	3	0	2	0	1.53	1482/1483	2.18	4.00	4.06	4.02	2.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	4	4	8	3.62	1288/1425	3.62	4.52	4.41	4.40	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	4	3	10	3.81	1361/1426	3.81	4.74	4.69	4.71	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	6	3	2	6	3.10	1324/1418	3.10	4.23	4.25	4.22	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	4	3	4	4	3.11	1316/1416	3.11	4.29	4.26	4.24	3.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	5	4	3	2	4	2.78	1113/1199	2.78	4.22	3.97	3.95	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	2	6	1	1	2.11	1285/1312	2.11	3.76	4.00	3.98	2.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	5	5	1	1	2.16	1268/1303	2.16	3.93	4.24	4.23	2.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	11	3	4	0	1	1.79	1278/1299	1.79	3.97	4.25	4.21	1.79
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	746/ 758	2.33	3.01	4.01	3.89	2.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.50	3.69	4.09	4.30	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	3.73	4.09	4.24	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	158/ 227	4.33	4.36	4.40	4.58	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.00	4.43	4.23	4.52	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	157/ 207	3.67	3.89	4.09	4.22	3.67
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****

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	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101
 Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 308
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	8	2	5	3.24	1420/1504	3.24	4.46	4.27	4.26	3.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	4	3	3	2.67	1472/1503	2.67	4.15	4.20	4.18	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	5	4	2	2	2.29	1282/1290	2.29	3.92	4.28	4.27	2.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	5	6	3	1	1	2.19	1447/1453	2.19	4.11	4.21	4.20	2.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	8	4	2	0	1	1.80	1419/1421	1.80	3.87	4.00	3.90	1.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	3	6	2	1	2.47	1349/1365	2.47	3.92	4.08	4.00	2.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	5	3	3	2.76	1425/1485	2.76	4.00	4.16	4.15	2.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	329/1504	4.95	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1411/1483	2.18	4.00	4.06	4.02	2.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1425	3.62	4.52	4.41	4.40	3.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1426	3.81	4.74	4.69	4.71	3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1418	3.10	4.23	4.25	4.22	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1416	3.11	4.29	4.26	4.24	3.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1199	2.78	4.22	3.97	3.95	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	2	6	1	1	2.11	1285/1312	2.11	3.76	4.00	3.98	2.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	5	5	1	1	2.16	1268/1303	2.16	3.93	4.24	4.23	2.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	11	3	4	0	1	1.79	1278/1299	1.79	3.97	4.25	4.21	1.79
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	746/ 758	2.33	3.01	4.01	3.89	2.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.50	3.69	4.09	4.30	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	3.73	4.09	4.24	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	158/ 227	4.33	4.36	4.40	4.58	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.00	4.43	4.23	4.52	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	157/ 207	3.67	3.89	4.09	4.22	3.67
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****

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	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 309
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1109/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	866/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1337/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	850/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1201/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1131/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	213/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1200/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1096/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	834/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	166/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 309
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 310
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1109/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	866/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1337/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1200/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1096/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	834/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	166/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 310
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 311
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	4	4.50	549/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1109/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	866/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1337/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1200/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1096/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	834/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	166/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 311
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0102
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 312
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	416/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	990/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	894/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	844/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1280/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1146/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1411/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	989/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	900/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1050/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1098/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	754/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	369/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	612/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1076/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1053/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	119/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	179/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	79/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	4.33

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0102
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 313
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	416/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	990/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	894/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	844/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1280/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1146/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1411/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1128/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	271/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	612/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1076/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1053/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	119/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	179/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	79/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	4.33

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0103
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 314
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	910/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1219/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1191/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	745/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	782/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1378/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1484/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	850/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1002/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1050/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1098/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	921/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	973/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1093/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1195/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1220/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	2.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	224/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	2.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	214/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	208/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	3.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	182/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	3.33
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****

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	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	9				

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0103
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 315
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	910/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1219/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1191/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	745/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	782/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1378/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1484/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	971/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	967/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1013/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1093/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1195/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1220/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	2.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	224/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	2.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	214/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	208/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	3.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	182/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	3.33
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****

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	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	9				

Course-Section: CMPE 312L 0101
 Title FUND DIGITAL DESIGN LA
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 316
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.20	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.11	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.87	4.00	4.01	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.92	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.29	4.26	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.93	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.30	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	3.69	4.09	4.12	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.43	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	3.89	4.09	4.14	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.84	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.24	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	3.98	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.25	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.13	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.77	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.47	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.74	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.36	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.63	5.00

Course-Section: CMPE 312L 0101
 Title FUND DIGITAL DESIGN LA
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 316
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	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	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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 314 0101
 Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR
 Instructor: YAN, LI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 317
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	295/1504	4.72	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	200/1503	4.78	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	180/1290	4.83	3.92	4.28	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	135/1453	4.85	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	169/1365	4.69	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	691/1504	4.89	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	258/1483	4.60	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	510/1425	4.71	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	549/1426	4.88	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	475/1418	4.59	4.23	4.25	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	232/1416	4.82	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	4.67	3.76	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.93	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.97	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.69	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.73	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.36	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.43	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.89	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: CMPE 314 0101
 Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR
 Instructor: YAN, LI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 317
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMPE 330 0101
 Title WAVES & TRANSMISSION
 Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 318
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	412/1290	4.60	3.92	4.28	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1201/1365	3.40	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1123/1483	3.75	4.00	4.06	4.08	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1141/1418	3.80	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1145/1416	3.80	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.93	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.97	4.25	4.30	4.00

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

Course-Section: CMPE 416L 0101
 Title CAPSTONE COMP ENGR LAB
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 319
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	914/1504	4.24	4.46	4.27	4.33	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	10	4	3.70	1231/1503	3.70	4.15	4.20	4.18	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	4	6	3	3	3.18	1223/1290	3.18	3.92	4.28	4.32	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	2	9	5	3.70	1214/1453	3.70	4.11	4.21	4.22	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	8	5	1	2.95	1321/1421	2.95	3.87	4.00	4.02	2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	6	7	0	3.13	1280/1365	3.13	3.92	4.08	4.09	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	6	10	0	3.25	1348/1485	3.25	4.00	4.16	4.14	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	10	6	2	3.42	1267/1483	3.42	4.00	4.06	4.11	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	9	9	4.32	991/1425	4.32	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	940/1426	4.68	4.74	4.69	4.72	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	939/1418	4.16	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	6	8	2	3.37	1275/1416	3.37	4.29	4.26	4.26	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	762/1199	3.88	4.22	3.97	4.05	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	966/1312	3.63	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1012/1303	3.86	3.93	4.24	4.34	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1017/1299	3.86	3.97	4.25	4.38	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.69	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	3.73	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.36	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.43	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 207	****	3.89	4.09	3.69	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 1
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	6	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 19		

Course-Section: CMPE 419 0101
 Title COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 320
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	910/1503	4.20	4.15	4.20	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	412/1290	4.60	3.92	4.28	4.32	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.11	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	943/1421	3.80	3.87	4.00	4.02	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.92	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1173/1504	4.40	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.29	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	429/1199	4.33	4.22	3.97	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.93	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.50	3.01	4.01	4.17	2.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 451 0101
 Title CAPSTONE II
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 321
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	3.92	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.11	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.87	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	3.92	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.00	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.29	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.22	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.93	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	3.01	4.01	4.17	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	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	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 641 0101
 Title TOPICS IN VLSI
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 322
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.15	4.20	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	3.92	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.11	4.21	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.87	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.67	3.92	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.00	4.16	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.46	4.69	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.00	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.52	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.23	4.25	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.29	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	4.22	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.93	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	3.69	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	3.73	4.09	4.09	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.43	4.23	4.69	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	3.89	4.09	4.40	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: CMPE 641 0101
 Title TOPICS IN VLSI
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 322
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 650 0101
 Title DIGITAL SYSTEMS
 Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 323
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	0	4	11	4.41	684/1504	4.41	4.46	4.27	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	633/1503	4.41	4.15	4.20	4.28	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	800/1290	4.24	3.92	4.28	4.36	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	631/1453	4.38	4.11	4.21	4.34	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	651/1421	4.13	3.87	4.00	4.27	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	742/1365	4.07	3.92	4.08	4.35	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	693/1485	4.31	4.00	4.16	4.24	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.46	4.69	4.79	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	580/1483	4.31	4.00	4.06	4.20	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	1050/1425	4.24	4.52	4.41	4.51	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	808/1426	4.76	4.74	4.69	4.80	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	867/1418	4.24	4.23	4.25	4.36	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	837/1416	4.29	4.29	4.26	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	766/1199	3.87	4.22	3.97	4.04	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	858/1312	3.83	3.76	4.00	4.31	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	737/1303	4.33	3.93	4.24	4.58	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	667/1299	4.42	3.97	4.25	4.56	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	3.01	4.01	4.24	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	129/ 233	4.17	3.69	4.09	4.56	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	140/ 244	4.17	3.73	4.09	4.09	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	179/ 227	4.00	4.36	4.40	4.66	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.69	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	166/ 207	3.50	3.89	4.09	4.40	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: CMPE 650 0101
 Title DIGITAL SYSTEMS
 Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 323
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CMPE 691C 0101
 Title SPEC TOP IN CMPE
 Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 324
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	3	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.46	4.27	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.15	4.20	4.28	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	615/1290	4.43	3.92	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.11	4.21	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.87	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	420/1365	4.40	3.92	4.08	4.35	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	563/1485	4.43	4.00	4.16	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1353/1504	4.14	4.46	4.69	4.79	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.00	4.06	4.20	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	700/1425	4.57	4.52	4.41	4.51	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.57	4.74	4.69	4.80	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	818/1418	4.29	4.23	4.25	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1416	4.29	4.29	4.26	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.22	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	572/1312	4.29	3.76	4.00	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	523/1303	4.57	3.93	4.24	4.58	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	656/1299	4.43	3.97	4.25	4.56	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	752/ 758	2.00	3.01	4.01	4.24	2.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	3.73	4.09	4.09	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.43	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.89	4.09	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	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 SPEC TOP IN COMPE
 Instructor: Darwish, Ali
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 325
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	2	6	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.15	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	507/1290	4.50	3.92	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	310/1453	4.63	4.11	4.21	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.60	3.87	4.00	4.27	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1365	4.71	3.92	4.08	4.35	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.00	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.46	4.69	4.79	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.00	4.06	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.52	4.41	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.29	4.26	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	149/1199	4.71	4.22	3.97	4.04	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	4.67	3.76	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.93	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	3.97	4.25	4.56	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	3.01	4.01	4.24	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						