

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 663
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	8	4.33	814/1639	3.44	4.10	4.27	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1451/1639	2.92	3.78	4.22	4.20	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1219/1397	3.13	3.95	4.28	4.26	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	3.29	4.01	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	335/1532	3.32	3.78	4.01	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	466/1504	3.74	4.06	4.05	4.12	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	1399/1612	3.28	4.00	4.16	4.12	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1001/1635	4.40	4.82	4.65	4.66	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1515/1579	2.95	3.74	4.08	4.07	2.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	933/1518	3.73	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1033/1520	4.07	4.62	4.70	4.68	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1347/1517	3.06	3.92	4.27	4.23	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	2	3	3.33	1385/1550	2.78	3.86	4.22	4.20	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	958/1295	3.32	3.67	3.94	3.95	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1183/1398	3.33	3.61	4.07	4.13	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1391	****	4.01	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1388	****	4.12	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.41	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	129/ 224	3.86	3.86	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	0	5	4	4.00	148/ 240	3.64	3.71	4.11	4.08	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	168/ 219	4.24	4.19	4.44	4.44	4.18	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	90/ 215	4.25	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	110/ 198	3.77	4.01	4.18	4.04	4.18	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 664
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	4	1	3.44	1516/1639	3.44	4.10	4.27	4.28	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	0	3.11	1573/1639	2.92	3.78	4.22	4.20	3.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1318/1397	3.13	3.95	4.28	4.26	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1205/1583	3.29	4.01	4.19	4.24	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1288/1532	3.32	3.78	4.01	4.05	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	977/1504	3.74	4.06	4.05	4.12	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	1506/1612	3.28	4.00	4.16	4.12	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1195/1635	4.40	4.82	4.65	4.66	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1550/1579	2.95	3.74	4.08	4.07	2.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1361/1518	3.73	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1151/1520	4.07	4.62	4.70	4.68	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1405/1517	3.06	3.92	4.27	4.23	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	1483/1550	2.78	3.86	4.22	4.20	2.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1023/1295	3.32	3.67	3.94	3.95	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	3.33	3.61	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391	****	4.01	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	****	4.12	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	115/ 224	3.86	3.86	4.10	4.06	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	166/ 240	3.64	3.71	4.11	4.08	3.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	60/ 219	4.24	4.19	4.44	4.44	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	111/ 215	4.25	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	103/ 198	3.77	4.01	4.18	4.04	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 665
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	0	3.00	1599/1639	3.44	4.10	4.27	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1628/1639	2.92	3.78	4.22	4.20	2.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1390/1397	3.13	3.95	4.28	4.26	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1572/1583	3.29	4.01	4.19	4.24	2.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1486/1532	3.32	3.78	4.01	4.05	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1303/1504	3.74	4.06	4.05	4.12	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1474/1612	3.28	4.00	4.16	4.12	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1350/1635	4.40	4.82	4.65	4.66	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1565/1579	2.95	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1481/1518	3.73	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1512/1520	4.07	4.62	4.70	4.68	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1506/1517	3.06	3.92	4.27	4.23	2.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1505/1550	2.78	3.86	4.22	4.20	2.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1158/1295	3.32	3.67	3.94	3.95	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	186/ 224	3.86	3.86	4.10	4.06	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	216/ 240	3.64	3.71	4.11	4.08	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	179/ 219	4.24	4.19	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	158/ 215	4.25	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	184/ 198	3.77	4.01	4.18	4.04	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 666
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1599/1639	3.44	4.10	4.27	4.28	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1628/1639	2.92	3.78	4.22	4.20	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1390/1397	3.13	3.95	4.28	4.26	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1572/1583	3.29	4.01	4.19	4.24	2.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1486/1532	3.32	3.78	4.01	4.05	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1303/1504	3.74	4.06	4.05	4.12	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1474/1612	3.28	4.00	4.16	4.12	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1350/1635	4.40	4.82	4.65	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	2.95	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	186/ 224	3.86	3.86	4.10	4.06	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	216/ 240	3.64	3.71	4.11	4.08	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	179/ 219	4.24	4.19	4.44	4.44	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	158/ 215	4.25	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	184/ 198	3.77	4.01	4.18	4.04	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 612 0101
 Title DIGITAL IMAGE PROCESSI
 Instructor: GUILFOYLE, KERR
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 667
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1397	4.50	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.01	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.74	4.08	4.17	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	3.86	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.67	3.94	3.95	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.01	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.12	4.28	4.49	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 620 0101
 Title PROB RANDOM PROC
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 668
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	3.78	4.22	4.26	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	417/1397	4.60	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	881/1583	4.17	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	692/1532	4.11	3.78	4.01	4.10	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.00	4.16	4.27	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.90	4.82	4.65	4.81	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	569/1579	4.33	3.74	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	1453/1518	3.30	4.39	4.43	4.49	3.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1397/1520	4.10	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1415/1517	3.30	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	4	1	1	2.90	1464/1550	2.90	3.86	4.22	4.23	2.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1287/1295	1.86	3.67	3.94	3.95	1.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.61	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	903/1391	4.14	4.01	4.30	4.47	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.12	4.28	4.49	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.41	3.93	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.71	4.11	3.96	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.83	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.83	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	4.00	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.50	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101
 Title INFORM THEORY
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 669
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	774/1639	4.33	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1397	4.17	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	965/1532	3.83	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.82	4.65	4.81	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	657/1579	4.25	3.74	4.08	4.17	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.62	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1517	4.50	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.00	3.67	3.94	3.95	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1342/1398	2.67	3.61	4.07	4.22	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1106/1391	3.83	4.01	4.30	4.47	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1078/1388	3.80	4.12	4.28	4.49	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	2.00	3.41	3.93	4.01	2.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.71	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.19	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.25	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.01	4.18	4.74	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.00	4.47	4.52	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	27/ 50	4.67	4.83	4.45	4.39	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	18/ 32	4.67	3.83	4.51	4.50	4.67	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.00	4.69	4.61	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	27/ 32	3.00	3.50	4.37	4.31	3.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101
 Title INFORM THEORY
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 669
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 630 0101
 Title SOLID STATE ELECTRONIC
 Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 670
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	3.78	4.22	4.26	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1268/1397	3.50	3.95	4.28	4.37	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	597/1583	4.40	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	989/1532	3.80	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1504	4.17	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.82	4.65	4.81	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1270/1579	3.60	3.74	4.08	4.17	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.62	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1347/1517	3.50	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1328/1550	3.50	3.86	4.22	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.67	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	916/1398	3.83	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.01	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.12	4.28	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.41	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1274/1639	3.89	3.78	4.22	4.26	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	11	4	3.89	1099/1397	3.89	3.95	4.28	4.37	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1310/1583	3.69	4.01	4.19	4.31	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	4	4	3.18	1387/1532	3.18	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	791/1504	4.06	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	4.00	4.16	4.27	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1220/1579	3.69	3.74	4.08	4.17	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	745/1518	4.56	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	10	4	3.89	1193/1517	3.89	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	4	7	3.89	1171/1550	3.89	3.86	4.22	4.23	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	746/1295	3.88	3.67	3.94	3.95	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	0	3	6	3	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	3	2	5	3	2.89	1349/1391	2.89	4.01	4.30	4.47	2.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	3	2	7	4	3.44	1209/1388	3.44	4.12	4.28	4.49	3.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	3	2	2	2	0	2.33	931/ 958	2.33	3.41	3.93	4.01	2.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 50	****	4.83	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 32	****	3.83	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 43	****	4.00	4.69	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: MARTIN, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 672
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	959/1639	4.15	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	813/1397	4.23	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	891/1583	4.15	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	957/1532	3.85	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1504	3.85	4.06	4.05	4.29	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	656/1612	4.38	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	7	0	3.64	1251/1579	3.66	3.74	4.08	4.17	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	968/1518	4.51	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	992/1520	4.76	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1256/1517	3.92	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	982/1550	4.14	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	215/1295	4.30	3.67	3.94	3.95	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	958/1398	3.77	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	895/1391	4.15	4.01	4.30	4.47	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	802/1388	4.31	4.12	4.28	4.49	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	707/ 958	3.55	3.41	3.93	4.01	3.55	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.71	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.00	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.83	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.83	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.00	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.50	4.37	4.31	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: MARTIN, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 672
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
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	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	7	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: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 673
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	959/1639	4.15	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	813/1397	4.23	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	891/1583	4.15	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	957/1532	3.85	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1504	3.85	4.06	4.05	4.29	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	656/1612	4.38	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1208/1579	3.66	3.74	4.08	4.17	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	454/1518	4.51	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	725/1520	4.76	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1083/1517	3.92	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	972/1550	4.14	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	398/1295	4.30	3.67	3.94	3.95	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	958/1398	3.77	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	895/1391	4.15	4.01	4.30	4.47	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	802/1388	4.31	4.12	4.28	4.49	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	707/ 958	3.55	3.41	3.93	4.01	3.55	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.71	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.00	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.83	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.83	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.00	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.50	4.37	4.31	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 673
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
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	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	7	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: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 674
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	959/1639	4.15	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	813/1397	4.23	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	891/1583	4.15	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	957/1532	3.85	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1504	3.85	4.06	4.05	4.29	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	656/1612	4.38	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1208/1579	3.66	3.74	4.08	4.17	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	933/1518	4.51	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	890/1520	4.76	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1083/1517	3.92	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	972/1550	4.14	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	529/1295	4.30	3.67	3.94	3.95	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	958/1398	3.77	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	895/1391	4.15	4.01	4.30	4.47	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	802/1388	4.31	4.12	4.28	4.49	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	707/ 958	3.55	3.41	3.93	4.01	3.55	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.71	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.00	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.83	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.83	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.00	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.50	4.37	4.31	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 674
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
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	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	7	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. D)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 675
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	959/1639	4.15	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	813/1397	4.23	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	891/1583	4.15	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	957/1532	3.85	3.78	4.01	4.10	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1504	3.85	4.06	4.05	4.29	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	656/1612	4.38	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1270/1579	3.66	3.74	4.08	4.17	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	807/1518	4.51	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	890/1520	4.76	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1172/1517	3.92	3.92	4.27	4.32	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1038/1550	4.14	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	586/1295	4.30	3.67	3.94	3.95	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	958/1398	3.77	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	895/1391	4.15	4.01	4.30	4.47	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	802/1388	4.31	4.12	4.28	4.49	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	2	0	1	6	2	3.55	707/ 958	3.55	3.41	3.93	4.01	3.55	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.71	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.00	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.83	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.83	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.00	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	3.50	4.37	4.31	****	

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 675
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
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	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 680 0101
 Title ELECTROMAG THEORY I
 Instructor: CARTER, GARY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 676
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	171/1639	4.90	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	316/1639	4.70	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	850/1397	4.20	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.78	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	283/1579	4.60	3.74	4.08	4.17	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	371/1517	4.70	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	424/1550	4.70	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	561/1295	4.13	3.67	3.94	3.95	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	965/1398	3.75	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	1076/1391	3.89	4.01	4.30	4.47	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1047/1388	3.88	4.12	4.28	4.49	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.41	3.93	4.01	3.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	3.71	4.11	3.96	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.00	4.58	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.83	4.45	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	5	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 698 8010
 Title Proj in Elec Eng
 Instructor: Hoch, Peter
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 25
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	990/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1481/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	881/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	824/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	317/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1001/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	760/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	807/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	474/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	638/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	148/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	4.01	4.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	44/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.61	2.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.79	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.54	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	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	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

Course-Section: ENEE 788B 0101
 Title TOPICS ELECTROPHYS PHO
 Instructor: KOSTOV, IORDAN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 677
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.10	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1481/1639	3.50	3.78	4.22	4.26	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1397	4.50	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.01	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.78	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	3.74	4.08	4.17	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.62	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	3.92	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.67	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.61	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.01	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1185/1388	3.50	4.12	4.28	4.49	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.41	3.93	4.01	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	148/ 240	4.00	3.71	4.11	3.96	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	179/ 219	4.00	4.19	4.44	4.23	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.01	4.18	4.74	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 82	4.00	4.00	4.52	4.74	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	53/ 78	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.52	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.50	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 82	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.37	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	3.64	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 53	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.03	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 42	4.00	4.00	4.75	4.78	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 37	4.00	4.00	4.58	4.33	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.83	4.45	4.39	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 32	3.00	3.83	4.51	4.50	3.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	42/ 43	3.00	4.00	4.69	4.61	3.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 32	4.00	3.50	4.37	4.31	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 21	4.00	4.00	4.52	4.42	4.00	

Course-Section: ENEE 788B 0101
 Title TOPICS ELECTROPHYS PHO
 Instructor: KOSTOV, IORDAN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 677
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	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	1	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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 788Q 0101
 Title TOPICS ELECTROPHYS PHO
 Instructor: CARTER, GARY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 678
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	841/1639	4.30	4.10	4.27	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	813/1639	4.30	3.78	4.22	4.26	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	3.95	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.75	4.01	4.19	4.31	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	506/1532	4.33	3.78	4.01	4.10	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	441/1504	4.44	4.06	4.05	4.29	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	848/1612	4.22	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	473/1579	4.43	3.74	4.08	4.17	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	561/1518	4.70	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1115/1520	4.60	4.62	4.70	4.79	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	597/1517	4.50	3.92	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	1029/1550	4.10	3.86	4.22	4.23	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.67	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	965/1398	3.75	3.61	4.07	4.22	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1146/1391	3.75	4.01	4.30	4.47	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.12	4.28	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	3.41	3.93	4.01	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

* *** 4.52 5.00 ***