

Course-Section: ENEE 206 0102  
 Title BASIC CIRCUIT THEORY  
 Instructor: YAN, LI  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 619  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1009/1249	3.83	4.37	4.27	4.36	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	896/1424	4.11	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	603/1396	4.14	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	905/1342	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	973/1450	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	880/1407	4.73	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1096/1399	3.91	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	921/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	570/1262	4.25	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	1209/1259	2.75	4.40	4.29	4.34	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	690/ 788	3.25	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 246	4.36	4.26	4.20	4.51	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	133/ 249	4.18	4.08	4.11	4.32	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	173/ 242	4.18	4.45	4.40	4.63	4.18	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	153/ 240	4.18	4.37	4.20	4.58	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	103/ 217	4.27	4.42	4.04	4.28	4.27	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 1	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 11

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

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: YAN, LI  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 620  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1069/1481	3.67	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1130/1481	3.44	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1036/1249	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1138/1424	4.17	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.29	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	920/1342	3.93	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1343/1459	3.11	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.50	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1013/1409	3.81	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1257/1407	3.79	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1294/1399	3.29	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1261/1400	4.19	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	1.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	1.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1256	1.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	100/ 246	3.70	4.26	4.20	4.20	4.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	174/ 249	4.15	4.08	4.11	4.23	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	144/ 242	4.20	4.45	4.40	4.36	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	53/ 240	4.65	4.37	4.20	3.96	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 217	4.15	4.42	4.04	4.11	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: YAN, LI  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 621  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1407/1481	3.67	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1420/1481	3.44	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.17	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.29	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	3.93	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.11	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	836/1450	3.50	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1325/1409	3.81	4.46	4.42	4.43	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1382/1407	3.79	4.77	4.69	4.67	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1277/1399	3.29	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	4.19	4.35	4.27	4.28	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1260/1262	1.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1257/1259	1.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1254/1256	1.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	240/ 246	3.70	4.26	4.20	4.20	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.15	4.08	4.11	4.23	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	184/ 242	4.20	4.45	4.40	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	103/ 240	4.65	4.37	4.20	3.96	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	165/ 217	4.15	4.42	4.04	4.11	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 610 0101  
 Title DIGITAL SIG PROC  
 Instructor: CHETTI, SAMIR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 622  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	883/1481	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	988/1249	3.89	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	816/1396	3.89	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1422/1480	3.89	4.64	4.68	4.74	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1189/1450	3.60	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1245/1409	3.78	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1153/1407	4.44	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1196/1399	3.67	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1095/1400	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1035/1179	3.11	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	907/1262	3.71	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	703/ 788	3.17	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 611 0101  
 Title ADAPTIVE SIGNAL PROCES  
 Instructor: ADALI, TULAY  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 623  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	947/1481	4.17	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	854/1459	4.17	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	704/1400	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	510/1179	4.17	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 611 0101  
 Title ADAPTIVE SIGNAL PROCES  
 Instructor: ADALI, TULAY  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 623  
 JUN 13, 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101  
 Title DET EST THEORY I  
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 624  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	788/1249	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1285/1450	3.33	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1120/1400	3.80	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1042/1256	3.75	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101  
 Title DET EST THEORY I  
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 624  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101  
 Title INFORM THEORY  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 625  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	173/1424	4.82	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	86/1342	4.90	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	91/1459	4.92	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1450	4.89	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1399	4.83	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	134/1179	4.75	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1259	4.91	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	142/ 788	4.64	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101  
 Title INFORM THEORY  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 625  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 631 0101  
 Title SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES  
 Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 626  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1481	4.43	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	257/1396	4.57	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	872/1459	4.14	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	384/1179	4.33	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1012/1256	3.83	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	2.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 636 0101  
 Title WIRELESS COMM  
 Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 627  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1221/1407	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	4.03	4.00	3.97	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
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 2	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010  
 Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES  
 Instructor: Hoch, Peter  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 628  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	268/1481	4.78	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	854/1481	4.22	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	765/1249	4.22	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	985/1396	3.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	565/1342	4.22	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	662/1450	4.22	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	969/1400	4.13	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	223/1179	4.57	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	976/1262	3.56	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1086/1259	3.56	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	992/1256	3.89	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	4.08	4.11	3.93	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	42/ 68	4.67	4.66	4.49	4.23	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	65/ 69	3.50	4.26	4.53	4.46	3.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	59/ 69	3.33	4.19	4.35	4.16	3.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	37/ 59	4.25	3.92	4.30	4.01	4.25	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	40/ 51	3.50	4.04	4.00	3.81	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	37/ 41	3.33	3.68	4.26	4.27	3.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	55/ 55	2.50	3.90	4.55	4.38	2.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	25/ 31	4.33	4.28	4.75	4.95	4.33	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 51	4.67	4.42	4.65	4.54	4.67	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010  
 Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES  
 Instructor: Hoch, Peter  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 628  
 JUN 13, 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010  
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI  
 Instructor: Taylor, Richard  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 629  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	280/1481	4.77	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	286/1481	4.69	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	909/1396	3.77	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	858/1342	3.92	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	924/1459	4.08	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	117/1400	4.92	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	381/1262	4.46	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	422/1259	4.69	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	345/1256	4.77	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	196/ 249	3.50	4.08	4.11	3.93	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	58/ 59	2.25	3.92	4.30	4.01	2.25	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010  
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI  
 Instructor: Taylor, Richard  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 629  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	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	6	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						



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

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 630  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	3.57	1334/1481	3.57	4.26	4.29	4.28	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1355/1481	3.43	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1132/1249	3.43	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1394/1450	2.83	4.10	4.09	3.96	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1228/1409	3.86	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1296/1407	4.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	1367/1399	2.71	4.30	4.26	4.16	2.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	2.86	1339/1400	2.86	4.35	4.27	4.17	2.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	4	1	0	1	2.67	1114/1179	2.67	3.94	3.96	3.81	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	2.57	1216/1262	2.57	4.18	4.05	4.07	2.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1004/1256	3.86	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010  
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT  
 Instructor: MARTIN, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 631  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	0	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1406/1450	3.42	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1031/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1257/1407	4.43	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	2	5	1	3.17	1308/1399	3.93	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	3	2	3.00	1312/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	753/1179	3.90	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1088/1256	3.58	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	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	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010  
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 632  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	0	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.42	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	670/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1046/1407	4.43	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	828/1399	3.93	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	852/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	590/1179	3.90	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1088/1256	3.58	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	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	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010  
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 633  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	0	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1124/1450	3.42	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	878/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1107/1407	4.43	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	973/1399	3.93	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1017/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	692/1179	3.90	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1088/1256	3.58	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010  
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 634  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	0	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1249/1450	3.42	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	891/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1184/1407	4.43	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	883/1399	3.93	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1095/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	705/1179	3.90	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1088/1256	3.58	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	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	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 683 0101  
 Title LASERS  
 Instructor: CARTER, GARY  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 635  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1459	4.80	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1025/1256	3.80	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 684 0101  
 Title INTRO PHOTONICS  
 Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 636  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1179/1481	3.80	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1136/1249	3.40	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1160/1424	3.80	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1125/1459	3.80	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1184/1407	4.40	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1217/1399	3.60	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	809/1256	4.20	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

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





Course-Section: ENEE 718D 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: RUTLEDGE, JANET  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 637  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	238/1342	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 2
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 3

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