

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 641
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	1269/1522	3.11	3.97	4.30	4.34	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	4	5	3.67	1303/1522	3.10	3.62	4.26	4.25	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	5	3.53	1154/1285	2.88	3.70	4.30	4.30	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1334/1476	2.92	3.68	4.22	4.26	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	760/1412	3.56	3.83	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	434/1381	3.58	4.00	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	1068/1500	3.12	3.78	4.18	4.13	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	994/1517	4.44	4.63	4.65	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1305/1497	3.17	3.61	4.11	4.13	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	392/1440	4.05	4.21	4.45	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	629/1448	4.24	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	972/1436	3.38	3.80	4.29	4.30	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	0	6	3.50	1270/1432	2.94	3.78	4.29	4.29	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1064/1221	2.79	3.37	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1280	2.75	3.44	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	3.25	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	3.50	3.92	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.61	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	188/ 215	3.50	3.50	4.36	4.21	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	212/ 228	3.81	3.21	4.35	4.29	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	154/ 217	4.44	4.44	4.51	4.45	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	170/ 216	4.31	4.31	4.42	4.35	4.13	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	108/ 205	3.75	3.50	4.23	4.26	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	2.33	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	1.33	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	2.33	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 641
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 642
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	3	3	1	2	2.43	1514/1522	3.11	3.97	4.30	4.34	2.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	4	0	2	2.54	1508/1522	3.10	3.62	4.26	4.25	2.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	4	2	0	2	2.23	1278/1285	2.88	3.70	4.30	4.30	2.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	1	3	1	2	2.38	1465/1476	2.92	3.68	4.22	4.26	2.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	1315/1412	3.56	3.83	4.06	4.03	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	0	3	1	3	2.75	1338/1381	3.58	4.00	4.08	4.13	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	1	4	0	2	2.31	1479/1500	3.12	3.78	4.18	4.13	2.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	1251/1517	4.44	4.63	4.65	4.62	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	1438/1497	3.17	3.61	4.11	4.13	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	4	2	4	3.31	1390/1440	4.05	4.21	4.45	4.46	3.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	3	1	6	3.62	1416/1448	4.24	4.56	4.71	4.71	3.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	5	0	2	2.62	1415/1436	3.38	3.80	4.29	4.30	2.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	0	2	2	2	2.38	1408/1432	2.94	3.78	4.29	4.29	2.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	2	3	1	2	2.58	1156/1221	2.79	3.37	3.93	3.94	2.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1240/1280	2.75	3.44	4.10	4.14	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1193/1277	3.25	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1117/1269	3.50	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.61	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	210/ 215	3.50	3.50	4.36	4.21	3.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	178/ 228	3.81	3.21	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	123/ 217	4.44	4.44	4.51	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	121/ 216	4.31	4.31	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	192/ 205	3.75	3.50	4.23	4.26	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENEE 610 0101
 Title DIGITAL SIG PROC
 Instructor: CHETTI, SAMIR
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 643
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	959/1522	4.20	3.97	4.30	4.45	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	7	4.05	1053/1522	4.05	3.62	4.26	4.29	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	910/1285	4.05	3.70	4.30	4.31	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	956/1476	4.10	3.68	4.22	4.31	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	6	7	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.83	4.06	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	953/1381	3.89	4.00	4.08	4.25	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	2	11	4.00	988/1500	4.00	3.78	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	15	0	3.70	1475/1517	3.70	4.63	4.65	4.73	3.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1147/1497	3.75	3.61	4.11	4.21	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	969/1440	4.35	4.21	4.45	4.48	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	954/1448	4.71	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	0	7	6	3.82	1189/1436	3.82	3.80	4.29	4.37	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	1139/1432	3.88	3.78	4.29	4.33	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	770/1221	3.79	3.37	3.93	3.83	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	941/1280	3.70	3.44	4.10	4.24	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1059/1277	3.78	3.94	4.34	4.52	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1269	4.38	3.92	4.31	4.51	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	829/ 854	2.57	3.61	4.02	4.08	2.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.50	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	3.21	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.44	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.31	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101
 Title DET EST THEORY I
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 644
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	3	6	4	3.63	1356/1522	3.63	3.97	4.30	4.45	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	4	3	3.25	1442/1522	3.25	3.62	4.26	4.29	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	5	2	3.38	1205/1285	3.38	3.70	4.30	4.31	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	5	2	3	3.14	1402/1476	3.14	3.68	4.22	4.31	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1165/1412	3.50	3.83	4.06	4.25	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1260/1381	3.19	4.00	4.08	4.25	3.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	4	4	3.44	1339/1500	3.44	3.78	4.18	4.22	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1320/1497	3.42	3.61	4.11	4.21	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1345/1440	3.60	4.21	4.45	4.48	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	1346/1448	4.07	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.07	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1334/1436	3.33	3.80	4.29	4.37	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	2	3	3.00	1364/1432	3.00	3.78	4.29	4.33	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	2	1	4	0	2.78	1128/1221	2.78	3.37	3.93	3.83	2.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	969/1280	3.64	3.44	4.10	4.24	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1056/1277	3.79	3.94	4.34	4.52	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	859/1269	4.07	3.92	4.31	4.51	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	3	1	2	6	3.69	612/ 854	3.69	3.61	4.02	4.08	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	3.50	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 228	****	3.21	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.44	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.31	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	2.75	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	2.25	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	2.33	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	1.33	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	2.33	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101
 Title DET EST THEORY I
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 644
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101
 Title INFORM THEORY
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 645
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	225/1522	4.83	3.97	4.30	4.45	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	787/1522	4.33	3.62	4.26	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1160/1285	3.50	3.70	4.30	4.31	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	892/1476	4.17	3.68	4.22	4.31	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	339/1412	4.50	3.83	4.06	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.00	4.08	4.25	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	3.78	4.18	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.61	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.21	4.45	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.56	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	793/1436	4.33	3.80	4.29	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1432	4.50	3.78	4.29	4.33	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1161/1280	3.17	3.44	4.10	4.24	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1183/1277	3.33	3.94	4.34	4.52	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1194/1269	3.17	3.92	4.31	4.51	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	726/ 854	3.33	3.61	4.02	4.08	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.50	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.21	4.35	4.39	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.75	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	2.25	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	2.33	4.45	4.66	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	1.33	4.41	4.40	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 631 0101
 Title SEMICOND DEVICES
 Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 646
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	492/1522	4.60	3.97	4.30	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.80	3.62	4.26	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	650/1285	4.40	3.70	4.30	4.31	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	629/1476	4.40	3.68	4.22	4.31	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1412	4.80	3.83	4.06	4.25	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.00	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	387/1500	4.60	3.78	4.18	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	506/1497	4.40	3.61	4.11	4.21	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.21	4.45	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.56	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	478/1436	4.60	3.80	4.29	4.37	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	758/1432	4.40	3.78	4.29	4.33	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.37	3.93	3.83	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.44	4.10	4.24	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.75	3.94	4.34	4.52	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.25	3.92	4.31	4.51	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.61	4.02	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI
 Instructor: TAYLOR, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 647
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	12	7	4.19	959/1522	4.19	3.97	4.30	4.45	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	894/1522	4.24	3.62	4.26	4.29	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	456/1285	4.57	3.70	4.30	4.31	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	10	4.05	987/1476	4.05	3.68	4.22	4.31	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	10	5	2	3.24	1293/1412	3.24	3.83	4.06	4.25	3.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	753/1381	4.11	4.00	4.08	4.25	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	940/1500	4.10	3.78	4.18	4.22	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	592/1497	4.32	3.61	4.11	4.21	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.21	4.45	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	494/1448	4.90	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	696/1436	4.43	3.80	4.29	4.37	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	732/1432	4.43	3.78	4.29	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	500/1221	4.20	3.37	3.93	3.83	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	900/1280	3.76	3.44	4.10	4.24	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	672/1277	4.43	3.94	4.34	4.52	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	611/1269	4.48	3.92	4.31	4.51	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	347/ 854	4.22	3.61	4.02	4.08	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.21	4.35	4.39	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	2.75	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	2.25	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	2.33	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	1.33	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	2.33	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI
 Instructor: TAYLOR, RICHARD
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 647
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010
 Title MODELING, SIM AND ANAL
 Instructor: MARKS, MAURY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 648
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	3	1	1	2.55	1510/1522	2.55	3.97	4.30	4.45	2.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	2	1	0	1.91	1515/1522	1.91	3.62	4.26	4.29	1.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	1	0	2	2.45	1273/1285	2.45	3.70	4.30	4.31	2.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	3	0	0	2.09	1466/1476	2.09	3.68	4.22	4.31	2.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	2	1	0	1.91	1404/1412	1.91	3.83	4.06	4.25	1.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	1	2	2.64	1346/1381	2.64	4.00	4.08	4.25	2.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1327/1500	3.45	3.78	4.18	4.22	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	963/1517	4.64	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	5	4	1	1	0	1.82	1492/1497	1.82	3.61	4.11	4.21	1.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	3	1	0	2.18	1433/1440	2.18	4.21	4.45	4.48	2.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	3	5	0	3.09	1439/1448	3.09	4.56	4.71	4.80	3.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	4	1	1	0	1.82	1431/1436	1.82	3.80	4.29	4.37	1.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	6	0	1	0	1.90	1423/1432	1.90	3.78	4.29	4.33	1.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	4	1	0	0	1.60	1213/1221	1.60	3.37	3.93	3.83	1.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	2	0	0	1.70	1276/1280	1.70	3.44	4.10	4.24	1.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	3	2	2	1	2.70	1258/1277	2.70	3.94	4.34	4.52	2.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	0	5	1	1	2.55	1252/1269	2.55	3.92	4.31	4.51	2.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 854	****	3.61	4.02	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	3.50	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	228/ 228	2.00	3.21	4.35	4.39	2.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	4.44	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	4.31	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	194/ 205	3.00	3.50	4.23	4.40	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	74/ 77	2.75	2.75	4.52	4.70	2.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	63/ 65	2.25	2.25	4.49	4.71	2.25	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	76/ 78	2.33	2.33	4.45	4.66	2.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	70/ 80	3.00	3.00	4.11	4.38	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	47/ 47	1.33	1.33	4.41	4.40	1.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	45/ 45	2.33	2.33	4.30	4.49	2.33	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010
 Title MODELING, SIM AND ANAL
 Instructor: MARKS, MAURY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 648
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 9 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad 2 Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0			
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - 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: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 649
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	4	4	4.11	1043/1522	4.11	3.97	4.30	4.45	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	1016/1522	4.11	3.62	4.26	4.29	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	787/1285	4.22	3.70	4.30	4.31	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	792/1476	4.25	3.68	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.83	4.06	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1381	4.60	4.00	4.08	4.25	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1168/1500	3.78	3.78	4.18	4.22	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	532/1517	4.89	4.63	4.65	4.73	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	807/1497	4.13	3.61	4.11	4.21	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	984/1440	4.33	4.21	4.45	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	3.80	4.29	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	984/1432	4.11	3.78	4.29	4.33	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	871/1221	3.57	3.37	3.93	3.83	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	839/1280	3.88	3.44	4.10	4.24	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	714/1277	4.38	3.94	4.34	4.52	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	586/1269	4.50	3.92	4.31	4.51	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.61	4.02	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	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 684 0101
 Title INTRO PHOTONICS
 Instructor: YAN, LI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 650
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	433/1522	4.67	3.97	4.30	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1513/1522	2.33	3.62	4.26	4.29	2.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1123/1285	3.67	3.70	4.30	4.31	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1245/1476	3.67	3.68	4.22	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.67	3.83	4.06	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.00	4.08	4.25	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1378/1500	3.33	3.78	4.18	4.22	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.00	3.61	4.11	4.21	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.21	4.45	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.56	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	3.80	4.29	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	3.78	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.37	3.93	3.83	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	959/1280	3.67	3.44	4.10	4.24	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	470/1277	4.67	3.94	4.34	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	3.92	4.31	4.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENEE 711 0101
 Title NEU NETS SIG PROC
 Instructor: ADALI, TULAY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 651
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	380/1522	4.71	3.97	4.30	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	465/1522	4.57	3.62	4.26	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	366/1285	4.67	3.70	4.30	4.31	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1476	4.71	3.68	4.22	4.31	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	411/1412	4.43	3.83	4.06	4.25	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	272/1381	4.57	4.00	4.08	4.25	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	892/1500	4.14	3.78	4.18	4.22	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	333/1497	4.57	3.61	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.21	4.45	4.48	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.56	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	357/1436	4.71	3.80	4.29	4.37	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	732/1432	4.43	3.78	4.29	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	540/1221	4.14	3.37	3.93	3.83	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	644/1280	4.17	3.44	4.10	4.24	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	743/1277	4.33	3.94	4.34	4.52	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	721/1269	4.33	3.92	4.31	4.51	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	330/ 854	4.25	3.61	4.02	4.08	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	3.50	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.21	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.44	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.31	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.50	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.75	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	2.25	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	2.33	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	1.33	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	2.33	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 711 0101
 Title NEU NETS SIG PROC
 Instructor: ADALI, TULAY
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 651
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						