

Course-Section: ENEE 206 0101  
 Title BASIC CIRCUIT THEORY  
 Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 713  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1674     | 4.64 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 578/1674   | 4.46 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 575/1423   | 4.57 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1094/1609  | 3.96 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1585     | 4.50 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 3.91 | 5.00  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1535     | 4.52 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.03 | 5.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 524/1651   | 4.36 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.50  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 955/1656   | 3.91 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.10 | 4.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1586     | 4.82 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.48 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1585     | 4.96 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.76 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1129/1582  | 3.93 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1562/1575  | 3.18 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.39 | 2.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1217/1380  | 3.38 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.03 | 3.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 229/ 265   | 3.64 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 3.50  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 188/ 278   | 3.97 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.36 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 215/ 260   | 4.19 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.51 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 191/ 259   | 4.03 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 150/ 233   | 4.06 | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.48 | 4.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 1      | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 0 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 1      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 0      | General             | 0 | Under-grad  | 2 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150         | 1        | 3.00-3.49       | 2       | 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: ENEE 206 0101  
 Title BASIC CIRCUIT THEORY  
 Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 714  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   | Instructor |   | Course | Dept      | UMBC | Level | Sect |      |      |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4          | 5 | Mean   | Rank      | Mean | Mean  | Mean |      |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 2 | 5.00   | 1/1674    | 4.64 | 4.23  | 4.27 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 1 | 4.50   | 578/1674  | 4.46 | 4.26  | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 1 | 4.50   | 575/1423  | 4.57 | 4.36  | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0 | 4.00   | 1094/1609 | 3.96 | 4.23  | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1 | 5.00   | 1/1585    | 4.50 | 4.04  | 3.96 | 3.91 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 1 | 5.00   | 1/1535    | 4.52 | 4.08  | 4.08 | 4.03 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 1 | 4.50   | 524/1651  | 4.36 | 4.20  | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 2 | 5.00   | 1/1673    | 5.00 | 4.65  | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0 | 4.00   | 955/1656  | 3.91 | 4.06  | 4.07 | 4.10 | 4.00 |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1          | 0 | 3.50   | 229/ 265  | 3.64 | 4.06  | 4.23 | 4.34 | 3.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 0 | 4.00   | 188/ 278  | 3.97 | 4.21  | 4.19 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 0 | 4.00   | 215/ 260  | 4.19 | 4.43  | 4.46 | 4.51 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0          | 1 | 4.00   | 191/ 259  | 4.03 | 4.21  | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 0 | 4.00   | 150/ 233  | 4.06 | 4.36  | 4.20 | 4.48 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 1      | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 0 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 1      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 0      | General             | 0 | Under-grad  | 2 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150         | 1        | 3.00-3.49       | 2       | 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: ENEE 206 0102  
 Title BASIC CIRCUIT THEORY  
 Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 715  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4  | 3.93 | 1296/1674  | 4.64 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 3.93  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6  | 4.38 | 763/1674   | 4.46 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.38  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 310/1423   | 4.57 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.71  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 5  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1  | 3.88 | 1242/1609  | 3.96 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.88  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 2  | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3  | 3.50 | 1223/1585  | 4.50 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 3.91 | 3.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 5  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2  | 3.56 | 1267/1535  | 4.52 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.03 | 3.56  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 8  | 4.07 | 1050/1651  | 4.36 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.07  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1  | 3.73 | 1260/1656  | 3.91 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.10 | 3.73  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 4.64 | 693/1586   | 4.82 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.64  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 4.93 | 453/1585   | 4.96 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.76 | 4.93  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4  | 3.86 | 1244/1582  | 3.93 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.35 | 3.86  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7  | 4.36 | 867/1575   | 3.18 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.39 | 4.36  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 1  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5  | 3.75 | 902/1380   | 3.38 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.03 | 3.75  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4  | 3.92 | 198/ 265   | 3.64 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 3.92  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4  | 3.92 | 206/ 278   | 3.97 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.36 | 3.92  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9  | 4.58 | 122/ 260   | 4.19 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.51 | 4.58  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4  | 4.09 | 185/ 259   | 4.03 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.42 | 4.09  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 4.17 | 130/ 233   | 4.06 | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.48 | 4.17  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type  | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---|--------|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A   | 0      |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B   | 5      |
| 56-83          | 5        | 2.00-2.99       | 2       | C   | 4      |
| 84-150         | 2        | 3.00-3.49       | 4       | D   | 0      |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 1       | F   | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | P   | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | I   | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | ?   | 5      |
|                |          |                 |         | Required for Majors   | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | General   | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | Electives   | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | Other   | 14     |
|                |          |                 |         | Graduate  | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | Under-grad  | 14     |
|                |          |                 |         | Major   | 0      |
|                |          |                 |         | Non-major   | 1      |
|                |          |                 |         | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |        |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 716  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 1628/1674  | 3.35 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 1146/1674  | 3.93 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 575/1423   | 3.91 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 743/1609   | 3.99 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.33  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.25 | 1565/1585  | 3.06 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 2.25  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1435/1535  | 3.37 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 3.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 1097/1651  | 3.95 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 4.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 958/1673   | 4.81 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.75  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.25 | 1474/1656  | 3.22 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 3.29  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1586     | 4.53 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.33  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1585     | 4.60 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 438/1582   | 3.77 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 3.58  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 1138/1575  | 3.55 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 3.25  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 666/1380   | 3.86 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.83  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 810/1520   | 3.58 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1024/1515  | 3.80 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1495/1511  | 2.85 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 2.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 474/ 994   | 3.40 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 252/ 265   | 3.17 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 3.25  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 188/ 278   | 3.57 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 215/ 260   | 4.04 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 251/ 259   | 3.33 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.00  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 41/ 233    | 4.05 | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.75  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 96/ 103    | 3.00 | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.10 | 3.00  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 72/ 101    | 4.00 | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 89/ 95     | 3.00 | 4.15   | 4.31 | 3.91 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 70/ 99     | 4.00 | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.29 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 94/ 97     | 2.00 | 3.76   | 4.14 | 3.48 | 2.00  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 60/ 76     | 3.00 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.03 | 3.00  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 63/ 77     | 2.88 | 3.65   | 3.93 | 3.70 | 3.00  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 50/ 53     | 3.00 | 4.19   | 4.45 | 3.87 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 43/ 48     | 3.00 | 3.86   | 4.12 | 3.67 | 3.00  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 47/ 49     | 2.00 | 3.74   | 4.27 | 3.27 | 2.00  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 60/ 61     | 2.00 | 4.03   | 4.09 | 3.20 | 2.00  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 49/ 52     | 3.00 | 4.21   | 4.26 | 3.50 | 3.00  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 47/ 50     | 3.00 | 4.23   | 4.44 | 3.82 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 34/ 35     | 2.00 | 4.22   | 4.36 | 3.29 | 2.00  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 20/ 31     | 4.00 | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.00  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 716  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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               | 1 | Required for Majors | 0    | Graduate  | 0 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 3 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C               | 0 | General             | 0    | Under-grad  | 4 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150         | 3 | 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               | 4    |   |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: ~~CHEN, YUNG-JUI~~ (Instr. B) BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 717  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 1628/1674  | 3.35 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 1146/1674  | 3.93 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 575/1423   | 3.91 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 743/1609   | 3.99 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.33  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.25 | 1565/1585  | 3.06 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 2.25  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1435/1535  | 3.37 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 3.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 1097/1651  | 3.95 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 4.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 958/1673   | 4.81 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.75  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.33 | 1444/1656  | 3.22 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 3.29  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1442/1586  | 4.53 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.33  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1539/1585  | 4.60 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 2           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | 1564/1582  | 3.77 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 3.58  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | 1547/1575  | 3.55 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 3.25  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | 962/1380   | 3.86 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.83  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 810/1520   | 3.58 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1024/1515  | 3.80 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1495/1511  | 2.85 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 2.00  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 474/ 994   | 3.40 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 252/ 265   | 3.17 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 3.25  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 188/ 278   | 3.57 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 215/ 260   | 4.04 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 251/ 259   | 3.33 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.00  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 41/ 233    | 4.05 | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.75  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 96/ 103    | 3.00 | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.10 | 3.00  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 72/ 101    | 4.00 | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.30 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 89/ 95     | 3.00 | 4.15   | 4.31 | 3.91 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 70/ 99     | 4.00 | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.29 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 94/ 97     | 2.00 | 3.76   | 4.14 | 3.48 | 2.00  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 60/ 76     | 3.00 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.03 | 3.00  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 63/ 77     | 2.88 | 3.65   | 3.93 | 3.70 | 3.00  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 50/ 53     | 3.00 | 4.19   | 4.45 | 3.87 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 43/ 48     | 3.00 | 3.86   | 4.12 | 3.67 | 3.00  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 47/ 49     | 2.00 | 3.74   | 4.27 | 3.27 | 2.00  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 60/ 61     | 2.00 | 4.03   | 4.09 | 3.20 | 2.00  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 49/ 52     | 3.00 | 4.21   | 4.26 | 3.50 | 3.00  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 47/ 50     | 3.00 | 4.23   | 4.44 | 3.82 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 34/ 35     | 2.00 | 4.22   | 4.36 | 3.29 | 2.00  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 20/ 31     | 4.00 | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.00  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: ~~CHEN, YUNG JUI~~ (Instr. B) BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County

Page 717  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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               | 1 | Required for Majors | 0    | Graduate  | 0 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 3 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C               | 0 | General             | 0    | Under-grad  | 4 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150         | 3 | 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               | 4    |   |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: ~~CHEN, YUNG-JUI~~ BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 718  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 0  | 3.58 | 1486/1674  | 3.35 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.58  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4  | 4.08 | 1090/1674  | 3.93 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.08  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3  | 3.83 | 1140/1423  | 3.91 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.27 | 3.83  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 3  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1  | 3.78 | 1306/1609  | 3.99 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.78  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 2  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3  | 3.70 | 1093/1585  | 3.06 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 3.70  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2  | 3.75 | 1147/1535  | 3.37 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 3.75  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4  | 3.75 | 1324/1651  | 3.95 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 3.75  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.83 | 832/1673   | 4.81 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.83  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0  | 3.63 | 1319/1656  | 3.22 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 3.63  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 4.82 | 371/1586   | 4.53 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.82  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 567/1585   | 4.60 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.90  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1  | 3.78 | 1290/1582  | 3.77 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 3.78  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3  | 4.00 | 1138/1575  | 3.55 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4  | 4.00 | 666/1380   | 3.86 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.00  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0  | 3.67 | 1092/1520  | 3.58 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.67  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0  | 4.00 | 1024/1515  | 3.80 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 9           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 3.67 | 1265/1511  | 2.85 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.67  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 9           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 994  | 3.40 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 3.96 | ****  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 6           | 0  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 2.50 | 263/ 265   | 3.17 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 2.50  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | 259/ 278   | 3.57 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.00  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 6           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3  | 4.00 | 215/ 260   | 4.04 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 6           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2  | 3.83 | 212/ 259   | 3.33 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.83  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 6           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2  | 3.50 | 208/ 233   | 4.05 | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.50  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 103  | 3.00 | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.10 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 101  | 4.00 | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.30 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 95   | 3.00 | 4.15   | 4.31 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 99   | 4.00 | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.29 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 97   | 2.00 | 3.76   | 4.14 | 3.48 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.50 | ****/ 76   | 3.00 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.03 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 3.50 | ****/ 77   | 2.88 | 3.65   | 3.93 | 3.70 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 53   | 3.00 | 4.19   | 4.45 | 3.87 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 48   | 3.00 | 3.86   | 4.12 | 3.67 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 10          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 49   | 2.00 | 3.74   | 4.27 | 3.27 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 61   | 2.00 | 4.03   | 4.09 | 3.20 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 52   | 3.00 | 4.21   | 4.26 | 3.50 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 50   | 3.00 | 4.23   | 4.44 | 3.82 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 35   | 2.00 | 4.22   | 4.36 | 3.29 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 31   | 4.00 | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.29 | ****  |      |



Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: ~~CHEN, YUNG JUI~~ BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 718  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors  |    |           |   |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A               | 4 | Required for Majors | 0    | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 6 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C               | 2 | General             | 0    | Under-grad  | 12 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150         | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D               | 0 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 12   |   |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: ~~CHEN, YUNG-JUI~~ (Instr. A) BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 719  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5  | 3.57 | 1489/1674  | 3.35 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.57  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6  | 3.79 | 1352/1674  | 3.93 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 3.79  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5  | 3.36 | 1311/1423  | 3.91 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.27 | 3.36  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 5  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2  | 3.75 | 1320/1609  | 3.99 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.75  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2  | 3.54 | 1205/1585  | 3.06 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 3.54  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 5  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2  | 3.56 | 1267/1535  | 3.37 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 3.56  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4  | 4.00 | 1097/1651  | 3.95 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 4.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 796/1673   | 4.81 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.86  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 1  | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1  | 3.40 | 1421/1656  | 3.22 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 2.95  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.64 | 693/1586   | 4.53 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.64  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 4.85 | 713/1585   | 4.60 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.85  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7  | 4.14 | 1043/1582  | 3.77 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.14  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5  | 3.71 | 1309/1575  | 3.55 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 3.71  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3  | 3.77 | 894/1380   | 3.86 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.77  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1  | 3.13 | 1327/1520  | 3.58 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.13  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 8           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 3.50 | 1303/1515  | 3.80 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 3.50  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1  | 3.29 | 1363/1511  | 2.85 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.29  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 7           | 2  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 2.80 | 937/ 994   | 3.40 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 3.96 | 2.80  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 2           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2  | 3.42 | 246/ 265   | 3.17 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 3.42  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 2           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3  | 3.42 | 251/ 278   | 3.57 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.42  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5  | 4.09 | 213/ 260   | 4.04 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.09  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 4           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3  | 3.40 | 240/ 259   | 3.33 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.40  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3  | 3.64 | 200/ 233   | 4.05 | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.64  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 103  | 3.00 | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.10 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 12          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 101  | 4.00 | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.30 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 12          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 95   | 3.00 | 4.15   | 4.31 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 11          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 99   | 4.00 | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.29 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 11          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 97   | 2.00 | 3.76   | 4.14 | 3.48 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 76   | 3.00 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.03 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 10          | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 2.75 | 71/ 77     | 2.88 | 3.65   | 3.93 | 3.70 | 2.75  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 10          | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | ****/ 53   | 3.00 | 4.19   | 4.45 | 3.87 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 11          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 3.33 | ****/ 48   | 3.00 | 3.86   | 4.12 | 3.67 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 10          | 2  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | ****/ 49   | 2.00 | 3.74   | 4.27 | 3.27 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 13          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 61   | 2.00 | 4.03   | 4.09 | 3.20 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 13          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2.00 | ****/ 52   | 3.00 | 4.21   | 4.26 | 3.50 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 13          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1.00 | ****/ 50   | 3.00 | 4.23   | 4.44 | 3.82 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI (Instr. A) BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County

Page 719  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors  |    |           |   |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 3 | Required for Majors | 0    | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 4 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 5 | General             | 0    | Under-grad  | 14 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150         | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | 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               | 12   |   |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 1 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: ~~CHEN, YUNG-JUI~~ (Instr. B) BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 720  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5  | 3.57 | 1489/1674  | 3.35 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.57  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6  | 3.79 | 1352/1674  | 3.93 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 3.79  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5  | 3.36 | 1311/1423  | 3.91 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.27 | 3.36  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 5  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2  | 3.75 | 1320/1609  | 3.99 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.75  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2  | 3.54 | 1205/1585  | 3.06 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 3.54  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 5  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2  | 3.56 | 1267/1535  | 3.37 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 3.56  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4  | 4.00 | 1097/1651  | 3.95 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 4.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.86 | 796/1673   | 4.81 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.86  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10          | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 2.50 | 1620/1656  | 3.22 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 2.95  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 12          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | ****/1586  | 4.53 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.64  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/1585  | 4.60 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.85  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 12          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 3.50 | ****/1582  | 3.77 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.14  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 12          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | ****/1575  | 3.55 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 3.71  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 12          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | ****/1380  | 3.86 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.77  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1  | 3.13 | 1327/1520  | 3.58 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.13  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 8           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 3.50 | 1303/1515  | 3.80 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 3.50  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1  | 3.29 | 1363/1511  | 2.85 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.29  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 7           | 2  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 2.80 | 937/ 994   | 3.40 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 3.96 | 2.80  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 2           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2  | 3.42 | 246/ 265   | 3.17 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 3.42  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 2           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3  | 3.42 | 251/ 278   | 3.57 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.42  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5  | 4.09 | 213/ 260   | 4.04 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.09  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 4           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3  | 3.40 | 240/ 259   | 3.33 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.33 | 3.40  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3  | 3.64 | 200/ 233   | 4.05 | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.64  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 103  | 3.00 | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.10 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 12          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 101  | 4.00 | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.30 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 12          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 95   | 3.00 | 4.15   | 4.31 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 11          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 99   | 4.00 | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.29 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 11          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 97   | 2.00 | 3.76   | 4.14 | 3.48 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 76   | 3.00 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.03 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 10          | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 2.75 | 71/ 77     | 2.88 | 3.65   | 3.93 | 3.70 | 2.75  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 10          | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | ****/ 53   | 3.00 | 4.19   | 4.45 | 3.87 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 11          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 3.33 | ****/ 48   | 3.00 | 3.86   | 4.12 | 3.67 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 10          | 2  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 3.00 | ****/ 49   | 2.00 | 3.74   | 4.27 | 3.27 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 13          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 61   | 2.00 | 4.03   | 4.09 | 3.20 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 13          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2.00 | ****/ 52   | 3.00 | 4.21   | 4.26 | 3.50 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 13          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1.00 | ****/ 50   | 3.00 | 4.23   | 4.44 | 3.82 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: ~~CHEN, YUNG JUI~~ (Instr. B) BOURNER, DAVID  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County

Page 720  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors  |    |           |   |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 3 | Required for Majors | 0    | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 4 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C               | 5 | General             | 0    | Under-grad  | 14 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150         | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | 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               | 12   |   |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 1 |                     |      |   |    |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 601 0101  
 Title LINEAR SYS THY  
 Instructor: THOMAS, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 721  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   | Instructor |   | Course | Dept      | UMBC | Level | Sect |      |      |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4          | 5 | Mean   | Rank      | Mean | Mean  | Mean |      |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3          | 1 | 4.00   | 1196/1674 | 4.00 | 4.23  | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | 215/1674  | 4.80 | 4.26  | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | 203/1423  | 4.80 | 4.36  | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 0 | 4.00   | ****/1609 | **** | 4.23  | 4.22 | 4.34 | **** |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3 | 4.75   | 167/1585  | 4.75 | 4.04  | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.75 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2 | 4.67   | 238/1535  | 4.67 | 4.08  | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | 175/1651  | 4.80 | 4.20  | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 5 | 5.00   | 1/1673    | 5.00 | 4.65  | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | 149/1656  | 4.80 | 4.06  | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.80 |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | 389/1586  | 4.80 | 4.43  | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | 811/1585  | 4.80 | 4.72  | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.80 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | 246/1582  | 4.80 | 4.30  | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3          | 2 | 4.40   | 819/1575  | 4.40 | 4.32  | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.40 |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |            |   |        |           |      |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2 | 4.67   | 295/1520  | 4.67 | 4.14  | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2 | 3.20   | 1393/1515 | 3.20 | 4.37  | 4.24 | 4.47 | 3.20 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 2 | 4.67   | 507/1511  | 4.67 | 4.37  | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.67 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 2      | Required for Majors | 0 | 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             | 0 | Under-grad  | 2 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 1       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 3        | 3.50-4.00       | 0       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 4 |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 1      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 612 0101  
 Title DIGITAL IMAGE PROCESSI  
 Instructor: GUILFOYLE, KERR  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 722  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |    |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 12 | 4.50 | 607/1674   | 4.50 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.50  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9  | 7  | 4.00 | 1146/1674  | 4.00 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 5  | 3.95 | 1061/1423  | 3.95 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.95  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7  | 6  | 3.81 | 1285/1609  | 3.81 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 3.81  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9  | 7  | 4.10 | 708/1585   | 4.10 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.10  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9  | 8  | 4.19 | 737/1535   | 4.19 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.19  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9  | 8  | 4.19 | 934/1651   | 4.19 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.19  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 18 | 4.82 | 868/1673   | 4.82 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.82  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6  | 0  | 3.40 | 1421/1656  | 3.40 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 3.40  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4  | 3.86 | 1382/1586  | 3.86 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 3.86  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 8  | 4.18 | 1427/1585  | 4.18 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.18  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 2  | 3.52 | 1399/1582  | 3.52 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 3.52  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2           | 0  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 7  | 5  | 3.45 | 1384/1575  | 3.45 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 3.45  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 3           | 2  | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6  | 4  | 3.71 | 938/1380   | 3.71 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.71  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5  | 4  | 3.50 | 1169/1520  | 3.50 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 3.50  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4  | 5  | 3.80 | 1180/1515  | 3.80 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 3.80  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5  | 6  | 3.87 | 1161/1511  | 3.87 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 3.87  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 8           | 5  | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1  | 3  | 3.00 | 881/ 994   | 3.00 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 20          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 265  | **** | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.51 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 278  | **** | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.42 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 260  | **** | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.67 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 259  | **** | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.66 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 233  | **** | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 20          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 103  | **** | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.56 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.62 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | 4.15   | 4.31 | 4.43 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 99   | **** | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.54 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 21          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 97   | **** | 3.76   | 4.14 | 4.26 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors                |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|
| 00-27          | 2        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A 8  | Required for Majors 0 |
| 28-55          | 2        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B 3  |                       |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C 0  | General 10            |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 2       | D 0  | Under-grad 13         |
| Grad.          | 9        | 3.50-4.00       | 6       | F 0  | Non-major 3           |
|                |          |                 |         | P 0  |                       |
|                |          |                 |         | I 0  |                       |
|                |          |                 |         | ? 2  | Other 4               |

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENEE 620 0101  
 Title PROB RANDOM PROC  
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 723  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.56 | 1495/1674  | 3.56 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 3.56  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3.22 | 1580/1674  | 3.22 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 3.22  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 1363/1423  | 3.00 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.22 | 1523/1609  | 3.22 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 3.22  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2.67 | 1532/1585  | 2.67 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 2.67  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.22 | 1398/1535  | 3.22 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 3.22  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3.78 | 1310/1651  | 3.78 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 3.78  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 742/1673   | 4.89 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.89  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.88 | 1584/1656  | 2.88 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 2.88  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2.78 | 1560/1586  | 2.78 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 2.78  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3.89 | 1509/1585  | 3.89 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 3.89  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 1504/1582  | 3.00 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2.78 | 1530/1575  | 2.78 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 2.78  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 5  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1217/1380  | 3.00 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.00  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.13 | 1327/1520  | 3.13 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 3.13  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.38 | 1349/1515  | 3.38 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 3.38  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.38 | 1340/1511  | 3.38 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 3.38  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1           | 5  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.67 | 954/ 994   | 2.67 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 2.67  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 265  | **** | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.51 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 278  | **** | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.42 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 233  | **** | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 103  | **** | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.56 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.62 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 99   | **** | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.54 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 76   | **** | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.20 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 77   | **** | 3.65   | 3.93 | 4.31 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 53   | **** | 4.19   | 4.45 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | 3.86   | 4.12 | 4.35 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 49   | **** | 3.74   | 4.27 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | 4.03   | 4.09 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | 4.21   | 4.26 | 4.59 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 50   | **** | 4.23   | 4.44 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | 4.22   | 4.36 | 4.84 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.64 | ****  |      |



Course-Section: ENEE 620 0101  
 Title PROB RANDOM PROC  
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 723  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 623 0101  
 Title: COMMUN THEORY I  
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 724  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 485/1674   | 4.60 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.60  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 870/1674   | 4.30 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.30  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.20 | 894/1423   | 4.20 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.20  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 1094/1609  | 4.00 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.22 | 584/1585   | 4.22 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.22  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 870/1535   | 4.00 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4.11 | 1020/1651  | 4.11 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.11  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 1267/1673  | 4.44 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.44  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 331/1656   | 4.57 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.57  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 453/1586   | 4.78 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.78  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 1071/1585  | 4.67 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.67  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 719/1582   | 4.44 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.44  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 495/1575   | 4.67 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.67  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.88 | 817/1380   | 3.88 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.88  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 760/1520   | 4.13 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.13  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 788/1515   | 4.38 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.38  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.50 | 642/1511   | 4.50 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 2           | 5  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 474/ 994   | 4.00 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.00  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 265  | **** | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.51 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 278  | **** | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.42 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 8           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 259  | **** | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.66 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 8           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 233  | **** | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 103  | **** | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.56 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.62 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 95   | **** | 4.15   | 4.31 | 4.43 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 99   | **** | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.54 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 97   | **** | 3.76   | 4.14 | 4.26 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 76   | **** | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.20 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 77   | **** | 3.65   | 3.93 | 4.31 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53   | **** | 4.19   | 4.45 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | 3.86   | 4.12 | 4.35 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 49   | **** | 3.74   | 4.27 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | 4.03   | 4.09 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | 4.21   | 4.26 | 4.59 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 50   | **** | 4.23   | 4.44 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | 4.22   | 4.36 | 4.84 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.64 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 623 0101  
 Title: COMMUN THEORY I  
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 724  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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               | 7 | Required for Majors | 2    | Graduate  | 8 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 2 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C               | 0 | General             | 2    | Under-grad  | 2 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150         | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 8 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 1    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 5    |   |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 630 0101  
 Title SOLID STATE ELECTRONIC  
 Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 725  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 916/1674   | 4.29 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.29  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.43 | 1531/1674  | 3.43 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 3.43  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.29 | 1326/1423  | 3.29 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.29  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | 1348/1609  | 3.71 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 3.71  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 1223/1585  | 3.50 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 3.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 508/1535   | 4.40 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.40  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.00 | 1097/1651  | 4.00 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 1540/1656  | 3.00 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 3.00  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | 1427/1586  | 3.71 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 3.71  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1585     | 5.00 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.29 | 1467/1582  | 3.29 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 3.29  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3.00 | 1487/1575  | 3.00 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 3.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 1  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.17 | 1190/1380  | 3.17 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.17  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 810/1520   | 4.00 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 827/1515   | 4.33 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1511     | 5.00 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 5.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 2        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 3      | Required for Majors | 0 | 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             | 0 | Under-grad  | 4 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 0       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 3        | 3.50-4.00       | 1       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 7 |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 1      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010  
 Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES  
 Instructor: Hoch, Peter  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 726  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |    |    |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 8  | 4.30 | 891/1674   | 4.30 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.30  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 5  | 3.95 | 1208/1674  | 3.95 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 3.95  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 5  | 4.05 | 986/1423   | 4.05 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.05  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9  | 5  | 3.90 | 1224/1609  | 3.90 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 3.90  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 1 | 4 | 8 | 6  | 1  | 3.10 | 1423/1585  | 3.10 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 3.10  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 4.11 | 817/1535   | 4.11 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.11  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7  | 7  | 4.00 | 1097/1651  | 4.00 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 15 | 4.75 | 958/1673   | 4.75 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.75  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8  | 4  | 3.78 | 1222/1656  | 3.78 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 3.78  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7  | 8  | 4.05 | 1275/1586  | 4.05 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.05  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 18 | 4.90 | 567/1585   | 4.90 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.90  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6  | 4  | 3.60 | 1371/1582  | 3.60 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 3.60  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8  | 7  | 3.90 | 1216/1575  | 3.90 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 3.90  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8  | 4  | 3.75 | 902/1380   | 3.75 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.75  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5  | 6  | 3.65 | 1098/1520  | 3.65 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 3.65  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4  | 9  | 3.95 | 1080/1515  | 3.95 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 3.95  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 5 | 2 | 8  | 5  | 3.65 | 1270/1511  | 3.65 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 3.65  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 15 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 1.80 | 985/ 994   | 1.80 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 1.80  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 12          | 6  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 2.50 | ****/ 265  | **** | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.51 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 13          | 0  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 3  | 3.43 | 250/ 278   | 3.43 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.42 | 3.43  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 14          | 4  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 2.50 | ****/ 260  | **** | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.67 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 14          | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 259  | **** | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.66 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 14          | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 233  | **** | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 14          | 4  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 2.50 | ****/ 103  | **** | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.56 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 14          | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.62 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 15          | 4  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | 4.15   | 4.31 | 4.43 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 14          | 4  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 99   | **** | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.54 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 14          | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 97   | **** | 3.76   | 4.14 | 4.26 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 13          | 0  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2  | 1  | 2.86 | 67/ 76     | 2.86 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.20 | 2.86  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 14          | 0  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 2  | 3.17 | 60/ 77     | 3.17 | 3.65   | 3.93 | 4.31 | 3.17  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 15          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 2  | 4.33 | ****/ 53   | **** | 4.19   | 4.45 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 14          | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 2  | 3.60 | 37/ 48     | 3.60 | 3.86   | 4.12 | 4.35 | 3.60  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 14          | 4  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 49   | **** | 3.74   | 4.27 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 14          | 0  | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3  | 0  | 2.83 | 58/ 61     | 2.83 | 4.03   | 4.09 | 4.46 | 2.83  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 14          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0  | 2  | 4.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | 4.21   | 4.26 | 4.59 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 14          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0  | 1  | 3.50 | ****/ 50   | **** | 4.23   | 4.44 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 14          | 4  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 3.50 | ****/ 35   | **** | 4.22   | 4.36 | 4.84 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 14          | 5  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.64 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010  
 Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES  
 Instructor: Hoch, Peter  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 726  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |    | Reasons             | Type | Majors  |    |           |   |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 5 | 0.00-0.99 | 7 | A               | 16 | Required for Majors | 0    | Graduate  | 9  | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 3  |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C               | 0  | General             | 0    | Under-grad  | 11 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150         | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D               | 0  |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
| Grad.          | 9 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F               | 0  | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0  |                     |      |   |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0  | Other               | 19   |   |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0  |                     |      |   |    |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010  
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 727  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 214/1674   | 4.83 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.83  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 830/1674   | 4.33 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 771/1423   | 4.33 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.33  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 963/1609   | 4.17 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.17  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3.20 | 1385/1585  | 3.20 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 3.20  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1332/1535  | 3.40 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 3.40  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 673/1651   | 4.40 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.40  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 257/1656   | 4.67 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.67  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 858/1586   | 4.50 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.50  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1585     | 5.00 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 1025/1582  | 4.17 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.17  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1575     | 5.00 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 5.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 114/1380   | 4.80 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 4.80  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4.17 | 726/1520   | 4.17 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.17  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 289/1515   | 4.83 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.83  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 816/1511   | 4.33 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.33  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.83 | 600/ 994   | 3.83 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.83  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 1           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 265  | **** | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.51 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 86/ 278    | 4.50 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.42 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 3           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 260  | **** | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.67 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 3           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 259  | **** | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.66 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 3           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 233  | **** | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 2           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4.00 | 74/ 103    | 4.00 | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.56 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 2           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 69/ 101    | 4.33 | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.62 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 95      | 5.00 | 4.15   | 4.31 | 4.43 | 5.00  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 49/ 99     | 4.50 | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.54 | 4.50  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 73/ 97     | 3.67 | 3.76   | 4.14 | 4.26 | 3.67  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 4           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.50 | 76/ 76     | 1.50 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.20 | 1.50  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 77   | **** | 3.65   | 3.93 | 4.31 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 53   | **** | 4.19   | 4.45 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | 3.86   | 4.12 | 4.35 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | 4.03   | 4.09 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 50   | **** | 4.23   | 4.44 | 4.64 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010  
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 727  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010  
 Title MODELING, SIM AND ANAL  
 Instructor: Marks, Maury  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 728  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.86 | 1353/1674  | 3.86 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 3.86  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 1146/1674  | 4.00 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.00  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 310/1423   | 4.71 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.71  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4.00 | 1094/1609  | 4.00 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.57 | 1540/1585  | 2.57 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 2.57  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 870/1535   | 4.00 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 432/1651   | 4.57 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.57  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3.67 | 1297/1656  | 3.67 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 3.67  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 1224/1586  | 4.14 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.14  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 1166/1585  | 4.57 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.57  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3.71 | 1326/1582  | 3.71 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 3.71  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 1138/1575  | 4.00 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.57 | 1009/1380  | 3.57 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.57  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.71 | 1059/1520  | 3.71 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 3.71  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.29 | 873/1515   | 4.29 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.29  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 990/1511   | 4.14 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.14  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 2  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 699/ 994   | 3.60 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.60  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 132/ 265   | 4.33 | 4.06   | 4.23 | 4.51 | 4.33  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 130/ 278   | 4.33 | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.42 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 102/ 260   | 4.67 | 4.43   | 4.46 | 4.67 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 4           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 236/ 259   | 3.50 | 4.21   | 4.33 | 4.66 | 3.50  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 4           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 233  | **** | 4.36   | 4.20 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 4           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 74/ 103    | 4.00 | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.56 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 91/ 101    | 3.67 | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.62 | 3.67  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 54/ 95     | 4.33 | 4.15   | 4.31 | 4.43 | 4.33  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 44/ 99     | 4.67 | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.54 | 4.67  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 50/ 97     | 4.00 | 3.76   | 4.14 | 4.26 | 4.00  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 4           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | 53/ 76     | 3.33 | 3.36   | 3.98 | 4.20 | 3.33  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 27/ 77     | 4.33 | 3.65   | 3.93 | 4.31 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 24/ 53     | 4.67 | 4.19   | 4.45 | 4.64 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 4           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 26/ 48     | 4.00 | 3.86   | 4.12 | 4.35 | 4.00  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 4           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 49   | **** | 3.74   | 4.27 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 29/ 61     | 4.00 | 4.03   | 4.09 | 4.46 | 4.00  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 25/ 52     | 4.50 | 4.21   | 4.26 | 4.59 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 44/ 50     | 3.50 | 4.23   | 4.44 | 4.64 | 3.50  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 5           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | 4.22   | 4.36 | 4.84 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 5           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.64 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010  
 Title MODELING, SIM AND ANAL  
 Instructor: Marks, Maury  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 728  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             | Type | Majors  |   |           |   |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|------|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 5 | Required for Majors | 0    | Graduate  | 4 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 2 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C               | 0 | General             | 0    | Under-grad  | 3 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150         | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 4 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 0    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 7    |   |   |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |      |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: ENEE 680 0101  
 Title ELECTROMAG THEORY I  
 Instructor: CARTER, GARY  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 729  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 342/1674   | 4.71 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.71  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 314/1674   | 4.71 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.71  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 819/1423   | 4.29 | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.29  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 743/1609   | 4.33 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.33  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 224/1585   | 4.67 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.67  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 870/1535   | 4.00 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 988/1651   | 4.14 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.14  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1656     | 5.00 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 5.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 301/1586   | 4.86 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.86  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 1002/1585  | 4.71 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.71  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 366/1582   | 4.71 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.71  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 423/1575   | 4.71 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.71  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 463/1380   | 4.29 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 4.29  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.20 | 1303/1520  | 3.20 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 3.20  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 543/1515   | 4.60 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.60  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 563/1511   | 4.60 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.60  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 2           | 4  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 994  | **** | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type                | Majors     |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|------------|
| 00-27          | 2        | 0.00-0.99 1     | A 3     | Required for Majors | 0          |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99 0     | B 3     |                     | Graduate 5 |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99 0     | C 0     | General             | 0          |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49 1     | D 0     |                     | 2          |
| Grad.          | 5        | 3.50-4.00 1     | F 0     | Electives           | 1          |
|                |          |                 | P 0     |                     |            |
|                |          |                 | I 0     |                     |            |
|                |          |                 | ? 1     | Other               | 5          |

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENEE 685 0101  
 Title INTRO COMM NETWORK  
 Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 730  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   |   |   |      | Instructor |      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
|   | NR          | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank       | Mean | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  |      |
| General   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 703/1674   | 4.44 | 4.23   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.44  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4.33 | 830/1674   | 4.33 | 4.26   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.33  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1423  | **** | 4.36   | 4.27 | 4.28 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 583/1609   | 4.44 | 4.23   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.44  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 251/1585   | 4.63 | 4.04   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.63  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 5  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 870/1535   | 4.00 | 4.08   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.00  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1651     | 5.00 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 5.00  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.65   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 310/1656   | 4.60 | 4.06   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.60  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1586     | 5.00 | 4.43   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1585     | 5.00 | 4.72   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 5.00  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 438/1582   | 4.67 | 4.30   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.67 | 495/1575   | 4.67 | 4.32   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.67  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 200/1380   | 4.67 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 4.67  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 367/1520   | 4.56 | 4.14   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.56  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 230/1515   | 4.89 | 4.37   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.89  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 266/1511   | 4.89 | 4.37   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.89  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 148/ 994   | 4.67 | 3.97   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.67  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 8           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 278  | **** | 4.21   | 4.19 | 4.42 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 103  | **** | 4.39   | 4.41 | 4.56 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | 4.33   | 4.48 | 4.62 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | 4.15   | 4.31 | 4.43 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 99   | **** | 4.36   | 4.39 | 4.54 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 97   | **** | 3.76   | 4.14 | 4.26 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | 4.03   | 4.09 | 4.46 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | 4.21   | 4.26 | 4.59 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50   | **** | 4.23   | 4.44 | 4.64 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | 4.22   | 4.36 | 4.84 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | 4.25   | 4.34 | 4.64 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 8      | Required for Majors | 2 | Graduate  | 7 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 0        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 0      | General             | 5 | Under-grad  | 2 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 1       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 7        | 3.50-4.00       | 3       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 2 |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |