

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 685  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	964/1670	4.07	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1429/1666	3.71	4.08	4.27	4.18	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	964/1406	4.07	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1294/1615	3.70	3.91	4.24	4.18	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1373/1566	3.27	3.73	4.07	4.04	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1097/1528	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	471/1650	4.14	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.59	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/1626	4.17	4.06	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	996/1559	4.14	4.25	4.46	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.71	4.77	4.72	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1361/1546	3.54	3.88	4.32	4.24	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	2.00	3.58	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	4.00	4.21	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	4.00	4.14	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	4.17	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	231/ 232	2.50	3.00	4.19	4.04	2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	147/ 239	4.00	3.83	4.21	3.99	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	165/ 230	4.25	4.38	4.44	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	204/ 231	3.50	4.00	4.31	4.11	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	115/ 218	4.25	4.13	4.18	3.93	4.25

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	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102  
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 686  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1379/1670	4.07	4.33	4.31	4.24	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1429/1666	3.71	4.08	4.27	4.18	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.07	4.16	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1418/1615	3.70	3.91	4.24	4.18	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1428/1566	3.27	3.73	4.07	4.04	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1122/1528	3.82	4.10	4.12	4.07	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1382/1650	4.14	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.59	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.17	4.06	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1374/1559	4.14	4.25	4.46	4.40	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1188/1560	4.71	4.77	4.72	4.67	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1379/1546	3.54	3.88	4.32	4.24	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	692/1323	3.75	3.77	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1362/1384	2.00	3.58	4.10	4.12	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.21	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.14	4.31	4.33	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	2.50	3.00	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	4.00	3.83	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	4.25	4.38	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	3.50	4.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	4.25	4.13	4.18	3.93	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 610 0101  
 Title DIGITAL SIG PROC  
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 687  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.33	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1136/1666	4.10	4.08	4.27	4.34	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	997/1406	4.10	4.16	4.32	4.36	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	3.91	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1010/1566	3.90	3.73	4.07	4.20	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	330/1528	4.63	4.10	4.12	4.33	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	1472/1667	4.10	4.59	4.67	4.74	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1254/1626	3.75	4.06	4.11	4.20	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	0	5	3.50	1461/1559	3.50	4.25	4.46	4.49	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1398/1560	4.30	4.77	4.72	4.81	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1449/1549	3.30	3.96	4.31	4.37	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	1	3	2.80	1507/1546	2.80	3.88	4.32	4.40	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1262/1323	2.63	3.77	4.00	4.03	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	758/1384	4.14	3.58	4.10	4.21	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.21	4.29	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	481/1378	4.71	4.14	4.31	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	4.83	4.17	4.03	4.04	4.83
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 7	Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101  
 Title DET EST THEORY I  
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 688  
 AUG 6, 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	3	1	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.33	4.31	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.08	4.27	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.16	4.32	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	3.91	4.24	4.33	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1406/1566	3.25	3.73	4.07	4.20	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1494/1528	2.75	4.10	4.12	4.33	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.59	4.67	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1157/1559	4.25	4.25	4.46	4.49	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.77	4.72	4.81	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	3.96	4.31	4.37	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1293/1546	3.75	3.88	4.32	4.40	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1356/1384	2.25	3.58	4.10	4.21	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1265/1378	3.25	4.21	4.29	4.42	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.14	4.31	4.51	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.17	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	147/ 239	4.00	3.83	4.21	4.53	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 624 0101  
 Title ERROR CORR CODES  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 689  
 AUG 6, 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	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.33	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.08	4.27	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.16	4.32	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	446/1615	4.60	3.91	4.24	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1566	4.71	3.73	4.07	4.20	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.10	4.12	4.33	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	307/1650	4.71	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.59	4.67	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.25	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.77	4.72	4.81	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	3.96	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	3.88	4.32	4.40	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	235/1323	4.67	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.58	4.10	4.21	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.21	4.29	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.14	4.31	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.17	4.03	4.04	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	202/ 232	3.50	3.00	4.19	4.30	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	215/ 239	3.50	3.83	4.21	4.53	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	120/ 230	4.50	4.38	4.44	4.69	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	114/ 231	4.50	4.00	4.31	4.58	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	143/ 218	4.00	4.13	4.18	4.47	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENEE 624 0101  
 Title ERROR CORR CODES  
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 689  
 AUG 6, 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	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 631 0101  
 Title SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES  
 Instructor: HERR, ANNA  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 690  
 AUG 6, 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	0	2	7	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.33	4.31	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.08	4.27	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	546/1406	4.56	4.16	4.32	4.36	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	633/1615	4.44	3.91	4.24	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	295/1566	4.67	3.73	4.07	4.20	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.10	4.12	4.33	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	757/1650	4.38	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1062/1667	4.63	4.59	4.67	4.74	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.25	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	622/1549	4.56	3.96	4.31	4.37	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	919/1546	4.33	3.88	4.32	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	641/1323	4.13	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	519/1384	4.43	3.58	4.10	4.21	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	548/1378	4.57	4.21	4.29	4.42	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.14	4.31	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.17	4.03	4.04	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010  
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 691  
 AUG 6, 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	3	13	4.81	290/1670	4.81	4.33	4.31	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.08	4.27	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1406	****	4.16	4.32	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	488/1615	4.56	3.91	4.24	4.33	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	2	3.81	1098/1566	3.81	3.73	4.07	4.20	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	532/1528	4.43	4.10	4.12	4.33	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1235/1650	3.94	4.16	4.22	4.30	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.59	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	347/1626	4.57	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.25	4.46	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	229/1549	4.88	3.96	4.31	4.37	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	333/1546	4.81	3.88	4.32	4.40	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	465/1323	4.36	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	628/1384	4.31	3.58	4.10	4.21	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	819/1378	4.31	4.21	4.29	4.42	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.14	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	300/ 904	4.38	4.17	4.03	4.04	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		



Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010  
 Title MODELING, SIM AND ANAL  
 Instructor: MACCARTHY, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 692  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	6	6	6	3	3.09	1616/1670	3.09	4.33	4.31	4.46	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	7	0	2.78	1637/1666	2.78	4.08	4.27	4.34	2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	11	4	3.74	1214/1406	3.74	4.16	4.32	4.36	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	5	9	1	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	3.91	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	5	6	5	0	2.39	1544/1566	2.39	3.73	4.07	4.20	2.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	7	3	8	3	3.23	1407/1528	3.23	4.10	4.12	4.33	3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	7	5	6	4	3.22	1550/1650	3.22	4.16	4.22	4.30	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	2	4.09	1482/1667	4.09	4.59	4.67	4.74	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	5	9	3	0	2.68	1585/1626	2.68	4.06	4.11	4.20	2.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	6	9	7	0	2.96	1523/1559	2.96	4.25	4.46	4.49	2.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	803/1560	4.83	4.77	4.72	4.81	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	8	8	4	1	2.74	1514/1549	2.74	3.96	4.31	4.37	2.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	8	7	2	3.09	1469/1546	3.09	3.88	4.32	4.40	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	3	6	6	3	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.77	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	6	8	5	1	2.78	1310/1384	2.78	3.58	4.10	4.21	2.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	3	4	10	2	3.23	1271/1378	3.23	4.21	4.29	4.42	3.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	6	6	6	1	2.82	1328/1378	2.82	4.14	4.31	4.51	2.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	2	6	1	0	2.70	858/ 904	2.70	4.17	4.03	4.04	2.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	3.00	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 239	****	3.83	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.38	4.44	4.69	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****

Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010  
 Title MODELING, SIM AND ANAL  
 Instructor: MACCARTHY, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 692  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 683 0101  
 Title LASERS  
 Instructor: CARTER, GARY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 693  
 AUG 6, 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	0	4	4	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.33	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	821/1666	4.38	4.08	4.27	4.34	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1147/1406	3.88	4.16	4.32	4.36	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1615	4.20	3.91	4.24	4.33	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	610/1566	4.29	3.73	4.07	4.20	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	136/1528	4.88	4.10	4.12	4.33	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.59	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.06	4.11	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.25	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	987/1546	4.25	3.88	4.32	4.40	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	590/1323	4.20	3.77	4.00	4.03	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	608/1384	4.33	3.58	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.21	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.14	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.17	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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