

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 302 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Electrical Engn</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yan,Li</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	10	4	4.00	1173/1542	4.00	4.49	4.33	4.37	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1459/1542	3.31	4.39	4.29	4.31	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	9	3	3.81	1105/1339	3.81	4.26	4.32	4.36	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1171/1498	3.89	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1090/1428	3.77	4.10	4.12	4.15	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	1256/1407	3.40	4.31	4.15	4.20	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	4	5	3.50	1331/1521	3.50	4.28	4.20	4.23	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	906/1541	4.75	4.79	4.70	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	6	3	0	2.83	1460/1518	2.83	3.87	4.11	4.13	2.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	0	5	8	4.13	1176/1472	4.13	4.53	4.46	4.46	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	1358/1475	4.19	4.71	4.72	4.74	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	7	4	1	3.00	1410/1471	3.00	4.28	4.32	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	3	4	3.25	1377/1470	3.25	4.27	4.33	4.35	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1310	****	4.23	4.06	4.11	****
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1210	****	4.34	4.18	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1211	****	4.58	4.37	4.45	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1207	****	4.46	4.41	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/859	****	4.22	4.08	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 302 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Prin Electrical Engn</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yan,Li</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>16</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	163/207	3.78	4.39	4.12	4.17	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	5	1	2	3.33	200/210	3.33	4.17	4.17	4.21	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	178/202	4.11	4.06	4.50	4.54	4.11
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	101/202	4.44	4.72	4.32	4.44	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	114/199	4.11	4.56	4.15	4.18	4.11

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	3	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	0				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 601 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Linear Sys Thy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Morris,Joel M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	869/1542	4.33	4.49	4.33	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	1069/1542	4.11	4.39	4.29	4.31	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1065/1339	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.31	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	885/1498	4.22	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1211/1428	3.56	4.10	4.12	4.13	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	599/1407	4.33	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1418/1521	3.11	4.28	4.20	4.24	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1455/1541	4.00	4.79	4.70	4.75	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	6	0	3.44	1315/1518	3.44	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.44
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1162/1472	4.14	4.53	4.46	4.48	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1142/1475	4.57	4.71	4.72	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1262/1471	3.71	4.28	4.32	4.36	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1193/1470	3.88	4.27	4.33	4.34	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1206/1310	3.13	4.23	4.06	3.99	3.13
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	924/1210	3.75	4.34	4.18	4.28	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	580/1211	4.50	4.58	4.37	4.51	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	918/1207	4.00	4.46	4.41	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	478/859	4.00	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 601 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Linear Sys Thy</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Morris,Joel M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>9</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	4.00	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 621 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Det Est Theory I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Chang,Chein-i</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.49	4.33	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.31	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1339	4.80	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	549/1498	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	142/1428	4.80	4.10	4.12	4.13	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1407	4.80	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	408/1521	4.60	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1047/1541	4.60	4.79	4.70	4.75	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	686/1518	4.25	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	954/1472	4.40	4.53	4.46	4.48	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.71	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	785/1471	4.40	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	311/1470	4.80	4.27	4.33	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	201/1310	4.67	4.23	4.06	3.99	4.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	251/1210	4.75	4.34	4.18	4.28	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.58	4.37	4.51	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.46	4.41	4.53	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 621 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Det Est Theory I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Chang,Chein-i</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	216/859	4.50	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 622 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Inform Theory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>LaBerge,E F</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	232/1542	4.83	4.49	4.33	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	203/1542	4.83	4.39	4.29	4.31	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1339	4.83	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1239/1498	3.75	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	681/1428	4.20	4.10	4.12	4.13	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	684/1407	4.25	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	518/1521	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	3.87	4.11	4.15	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1472	4.83	4.53	4.46	4.48	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	727/1475	4.83	4.71	4.72	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	463/1471	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	498/1470	4.67	4.27	4.33	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	324/1310	4.50	4.23	4.06	3.99	4.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1210	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.58	4.37	4.51	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 622 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Inform Theory</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>LaBerge,E F</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>6</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.46	4.41	4.53	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 623 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Commun Theory I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Morris,Joel M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	962/1542	4.25	4.49	4.33	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	615/1542	4.50	4.39	4.29	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	582/1339	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1498	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1428	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1407	4.75	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	518/1521	4.50	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1124/1541	4.50	4.79	4.70	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	686/1518	4.25	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.53	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1197/1475	4.50	4.71	4.72	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	637/1471	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	692/1470	4.50	4.27	4.33	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	761/1310	4.00	4.23	4.06	3.99	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	251/1210	4.75	4.34	4.18	4.28	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.58	4.37	4.51	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	402/1207	4.75	4.46	4.41	4.53	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 623 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Commun Theory I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Morris,Joel M</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	216/859	4.50	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.50

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 631 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Semicond Devices</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Choa,Fow-sen</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>1</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.49	4.33	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1360/1428	3.00	4.10	4.12	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.31	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1521	5.00	4.28	4.20	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.75	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.53	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.71	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1471	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.27	4.33	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1310	5.00	4.23	4.06	3.99	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1210	5.00	4.34	4.18	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.58	4.37	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1207	5.00	4.46	4.41	4.53	5.00
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.39	4.12	4.20	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/210	5.00	4.17	4.17	4.12	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	183/202	4.00	4.06	4.50	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/202	5.00	4.72	4.32	4.24	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 631 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Semicond Devices</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Choa,Fow-sen</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>1</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/199	5.00	4.56	4.15	4.30	5.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/69	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.71	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/68	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.55	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/73	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.54	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/67	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.35	5.00
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	27/32	3.00	3.00	4.20	4.06	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/35	4.00	4.00	4.36	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/25	5.00	5.00	4.59	4.53	5.00
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/30	5.00	4.00	4.27	4.36	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 631 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Semicond Devices</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Choa,Fow-sen</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>1</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/29	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.42	5.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 661 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>System Archit And Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Taylor,Richard</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	250/1542	4.81	4.49	4.33	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	615/1542	4.50	4.39	4.29	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	240/1498	4.76	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	958/1428	3.93	4.10	4.12	4.13	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	706/1407	4.23	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	133/1521	4.87	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	373/1518	4.50	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1472	5.00	4.53	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.71	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	513/1471	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	438/1470	4.71	4.27	4.33	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	0	1	1	12	4.31	515/1310	4.31	4.23	4.06	3.99	4.31
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	634/1210	4.25	4.34	4.18	4.28	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	521/1211	4.58	4.58	4.37	4.51	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	300/1207	4.85	4.46	4.41	4.53	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	547/859	3.90	4.22	4.08	4.08	3.90

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 661 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>System Archit And Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Taylor,Richard</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/210	****	4.17	4.17	4.12	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.17	4.35	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.06	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.45	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	6	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 663 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>System Implem Integratio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Martin,Paul B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	1095/1542	4.12	4.49	4.33	4.39	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	740/1542	4.41	4.39	4.29	4.31	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	234/1339	4.82	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	745/1498	4.35	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	421/1428	4.47	4.10	4.12	4.13	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	766/1407	4.18	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	560/1521	4.47	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1310/1518	3.45	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	538/1472	4.71	4.53	4.46	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	323/1475	4.94	4.71	4.72	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	681/1471	4.47	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	800/1470	4.41	4.27	4.33	4.34	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	354/1310	4.47	4.23	4.06	3.99	4.47
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	634/1210	4.25	4.34	4.18	4.28	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	671/1211	4.42	4.58	4.37	4.51	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	570/1207	4.58	4.46	4.41	4.53	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	401/859	4.18	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.18



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 663 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>System Implem Integratio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Martin,Paul B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	4.39	4.12	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/210	****	4.17	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	****	4.06	4.50	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/202	****	4.72	4.32	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/199	****	4.56	4.15	4.30	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	****	4.56	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/69	****	5.00	4.60	4.71	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.50	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	5.00	4.54	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.17	4.35	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/35	****	4.00	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/25	****	5.00	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/23	****	****	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	4.00	4.29	4.42	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 663 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>System Implem Integratio</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Martin,Paul B.</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>20</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Major 12
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 8
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 672 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Decision &amp; Risk Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>MacCarthy,John</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	512/1542	4.60	4.49	4.33	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	954/1542	4.24	4.39	4.29	4.31	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	946/1339	4.10	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	10	6	3.86	1188/1498	3.86	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	5	8	3.75	1097/1428	3.75	4.10	4.12	4.13	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	792/1407	4.14	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	222/1521	4.76	4.28	4.20	4.24	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1255/1518	3.59	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.59
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	3	4	11	4.10	1193/1472	4.10	4.53	4.46	4.48	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	1181/1475	4.52	4.71	4.72	4.76	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	3	7	8	3.95	1141/1471	3.95	4.28	4.32	4.36	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	2	12	3.95	1145/1470	3.95	4.27	4.33	4.34	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	5	4	8	3.80	923/1310	3.80	4.23	4.06	3.99	3.80
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	3	6	2	3	2.83	1169/1210	2.83	4.34	4.18	4.28	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	3	6	3	3.22	1148/1211	3.22	4.58	4.37	4.51	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	0	4	8	3	3.44	1116/1207	3.44	4.46	4.41	4.53	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	4	16	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/859	****	4.22	4.08	4.08	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 672 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Decision &amp; Risk Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>MacCarthy,John</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	4.17	4.17	4.12	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.06	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.00	4.29	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	14	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 683 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Lasers</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yan,Li</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>2</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1173/1542	4.00	4.49	4.33	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1122/1542	4.00	4.39	4.29	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1296/1339	3.00	4.26	4.32	4.31	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.10	4.12	4.13	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.31	4.15	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1331/1521	3.50	4.28	4.20	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1283/1518	3.50	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.53	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1197/1475	4.50	4.71	4.72	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1471	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1470	3.50	4.27	4.33	4.34	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	430/1210	4.50	4.34	4.18	4.28	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1211	5.00	4.58	4.37	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1097/1207	3.50	4.46	4.41	4.53	3.50
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	28/30	3.00	4.00	4.27	4.36	3.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENEE 683 1</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Lasers</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yan,Li</b>

**Term - Spring 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>2</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	27/29	3.00	4.00	4.29	4.42	3.00

### Frequency Distribution

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