

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 01
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	85
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	44	4.75	339/1560	4.75	4.26	4.35	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	48	4.86	178/1559	4.86	4.22	4.31	4.35	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	43	4.75	328/1371	4.75	4.21	4.38	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	0	1	5	11	24	4.41	678/1519	4.41	4.10	4.27	4.33	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	18	1	4	5	10	16	4.00	948/1452	4.00	3.93	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	18	2	0	3	12	19	4.28	682/1430	4.28	4.12	4.16	4.20	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	9	44	4.76	233/1539	4.76	4.11	4.23	4.27	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	51	4.93	363/1560	4.93	4.62	4.64	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	2	6	36	4.77	165/1545	4.77	4.02	4.14	4.19	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	48	4.89	262/1496	4.89	4.50	4.49	4.54	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	53	4.98	112/1498	4.98	4.85	4.75	4.79	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	8	45	4.81	280/1496	4.81	4.06	4.37	4.43	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	8	42	4.67	519/1494	4.67	4.23	4.37	4.43	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	3	11	34	4.59	274/1352	4.59	3.97	4.12	4.23	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	5	2	5	3.64	****/1248	****	3.98	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	****/1250	****	4.04	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	0	3	1	9	4.21	****/1239	****	4.22	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	42	5	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	****/906	****	3.93	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 01
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	85
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	4	4	9	12	8	3.43	197/206	3.43	3.97	4.25	4.22	3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	8	11	11	6	3.35	205/214	3.35	3.68	4.31	4.33	3.35
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	1	6	9	21	4.35	152/204	4.35	4.68	4.52	4.57	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	6	0	11	11	9	3.46	201/207	3.46	3.90	4.44	4.42	3.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	5	5	9	9	9	3.32	191/199	3.32	3.79	4.27	4.17	3.32
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 01
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	85
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	46	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	17	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 610 01
Title:	Digital Sig Proc
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	1	1	5	3.80	1349/1560	3.80	4.26	4.35	4.37	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1448/1559	3.50	4.22	4.31	4.29	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1299/1371	3.50	4.21	4.38	4.37	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1202/1519	3.88	4.10	4.27	4.29	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	648/1452	4.30	3.93	4.18	4.23	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	323/1430	4.60	4.12	4.16	4.28	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	0	2	2	3.11	1463/1539	3.11	4.11	4.23	4.26	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1122/1560	4.44	4.62	4.64	4.72	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1466/1545	3.14	4.02	4.14	4.11	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1184/1496	4.20	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1023/1498	4.70	4.85	4.75	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1356/1496	3.60	4.06	4.37	4.29	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	0	2	4	3.60	1361/1494	3.60	4.23	4.37	4.31	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	1157/1352	3.50	3.97	4.12	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.98	4.23	4.28	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1154/1250	3.50	4.04	4.39	4.49	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	861/1239	4.25	4.22	4.45	4.57	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	519/906	4.00	3.93	4.13	4.08	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 610 01
Title:	Digital Sig Proc
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	3.97	4.25	4.17	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	3.68	4.31	3.86	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	4.68	4.52	4.15	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	3.90	4.44	3.84	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	3.79	4.27	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.66	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	3.29	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 610 01
Title:	Digital Sig Proc
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	3.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 621 01
Title:	Det Est Theory I
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	945/1560	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.37	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1302/1559	3.86	4.22	4.31	4.29	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	967/1371	4.17	4.21	4.38	4.37	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1319/1519	3.71	4.10	4.27	4.29	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	530/1452	4.43	3.93	4.18	4.23	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	889/1430	4.00	4.12	4.16	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1408/1539	3.43	4.11	4.23	4.26	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1379/1560	4.14	4.62	4.64	4.72	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1181/1545	3.80	4.02	4.14	4.11	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	871/1496	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1077/1498	4.67	4.85	4.75	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1341/1496	3.67	4.06	4.37	4.29	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.23	4.37	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	823/1352	4.00	3.97	4.12	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1158/1248	3.25	3.98	4.23	4.28	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	945/1250	4.00	4.04	4.39	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	861/1239	4.25	4.22	4.45	4.57	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	778/906	3.50	3.93	4.13	4.08	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 621 01
Title:	Det Est Theory I
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 622 01
Title:	Inform Theory
Instructor:	Chang,Chen-i

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1560	4.33	4.26	4.35	4.37	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1158/1559	4.00	4.22	4.31	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1066/1371	4.00	4.21	4.38	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1237/1519	3.83	4.10	4.27	4.29	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1439/1452	2.50	3.93	4.18	4.23	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1061/1430	3.80	4.12	4.16	4.28	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1445/1560	4.00	4.62	4.64	4.72	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1342/1545	3.50	4.02	4.14	4.11	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1281/1496	4.00	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1077/1498	4.67	4.85	4.75	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1378/1496	3.50	4.06	4.37	4.29	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.23	4.37	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1224/1352	3.33	3.97	4.12	3.99	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	746/1248	4.17	3.98	4.23	4.28	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1057/1250	3.83	4.04	4.39	4.49	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	911/1239	4.17	4.22	4.45	4.57	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	360/906	4.33	3.93	4.13	4.08	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 622 01
Title:	Inform Theory
Instructor:	Chang,Chen-i

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 631 01
Title:	Semicond Devices
Instructor:	Choa,Fow-sen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	4.14	1100/1560	4.14	4.26	4.35	4.37	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1049/1559	4.14	4.22	4.31	4.29	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1177/1371	3.86	4.21	4.38	4.37	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1319/1519	3.71	4.10	4.27	4.29	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1349/1452	3.33	3.93	4.18	4.23	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1154/1430	3.67	4.12	4.16	4.28	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1227/1539	3.83	4.11	4.23	4.26	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1228/1560	4.33	4.62	4.64	4.72	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.02	4.14	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1223/1496	4.14	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.85	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1378/1496	3.50	4.06	4.37	4.29	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1266/1494	3.83	4.23	4.37	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1261/1352	3.17	3.97	4.12	3.99	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1174/1248	3.17	3.98	4.23	4.28	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1189/1250	3.33	4.04	4.39	4.49	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1164/1239	3.50	4.22	4.45	4.57	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	897/906	2.33	3.93	4.13	4.08	2.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 631 01
Title:	Semicond Devices
Instructor:	Choa,Fow-sen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	62/206	4.50	3.97	4.25	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	169/214	4.00	3.68	4.31	3.86	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/204	5.00	4.68	4.52	4.15	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	136/207	4.33	3.90	4.44	3.84	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	110/199	4.25	3.79	4.27	4.11	4.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	16	4.68	430/1560	4.68	4.26	4.35	4.37	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	508/1559	4.59	4.22	4.31	4.29	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1371	4.88	4.21	4.38	4.37	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	116/1519	4.90	4.10	4.27	4.29	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	771/1452	4.19	3.93	4.18	4.23	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	506/1430	4.44	4.12	4.16	4.28	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	392/1539	4.64	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.62	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	378/1545	4.53	4.02	4.14	4.11	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	297/1496	4.86	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	556/1498	4.91	4.85	4.75	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	213/1496	4.86	4.06	4.37	4.29	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	247/1494	4.86	4.23	4.37	4.31	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	449/1352	4.42	3.97	4.12	3.99	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	2	12	4.19	723/1248	4.19	3.98	4.23	4.28	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	829/1250	4.24	4.04	4.39	4.49	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	514/1239	4.71	4.22	4.45	4.57	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	152/906	4.69	3.93	4.13	4.08	4.69

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/214	****	3.68	4.31	3.86	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.89	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.06	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.66	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	3.99	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	3.29	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	3.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Major 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 21
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	1127/1560	4.12	4.26	4.35	4.37	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	600/1559	4.53	4.22	4.31	4.29	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	609/1371	4.53	4.21	4.38	4.37	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	592/1519	4.47	4.10	4.27	4.29	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	310/1452	4.63	3.93	4.18	4.23	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	718/1430	4.24	4.12	4.16	4.28	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	177/1539	4.82	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.62	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1244/1545	3.70	4.02	4.14	4.11	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	262/1496	4.88	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.85	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	532/1496	4.65	4.06	4.37	4.29	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	702/1494	4.53	4.23	4.37	4.31	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	300/1352	4.56	3.97	4.12	3.99	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	906/1248	3.92	3.98	4.23	4.28	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	556/1250	4.58	4.04	4.39	4.49	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	756/1239	4.42	4.22	4.45	4.57	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	519/906	4.00	3.93	4.13	4.08	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Major 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 683 01
Title:	Lasers
Instructor:	Yan,Li

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	5	2	3.70	1411/1560	3.70	4.26	4.35	4.37	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1263/1559	3.90	4.22	4.31	4.29	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	1340/1371	3.20	4.21	4.38	4.37	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1444/1519	3.40	4.10	4.27	4.29	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	1331/1452	3.40	3.93	4.18	4.23	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	0	3	2	3.50	1244/1430	3.50	4.12	4.16	4.28	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.62	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1123/1545	3.88	4.02	4.14	4.11	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	953/1496	4.44	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1498	4.89	4.85	4.75	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	6	1	3.67	1341/1496	3.67	4.06	4.37	4.29	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1098/1494	4.11	4.23	4.37	4.31	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	3.97	4.12	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	822/1248	4.00	3.98	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1057/1250	3.83	4.04	4.39	4.49	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1076/1239	3.83	4.22	4.45	4.57	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.93	4.13	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 683 01
Title:	Lasers
Instructor:	Yan,Li

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	3.68	4.31	3.86	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 691 01
Title:	Special Topics Elec Engr
Instructor:	Adali,Tulay

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	4.57	578/1560	4.57	4.26	4.35	4.37	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	534/1559	4.57	4.22	4.31	4.29	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.21	4.38	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	469/1519	4.57	4.10	4.27	4.29	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	360/1452	4.57	3.93	4.18	4.23	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1430	4.60	4.12	4.16	4.28	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	649/1539	4.43	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	840/1560	4.71	4.62	4.64	4.72	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1545	4.83	4.02	4.14	4.11	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	782/1496	4.57	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	704/1498	4.86	4.85	4.75	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	963/1496	4.29	4.06	4.37	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	825/1494	4.43	4.23	4.37	4.31	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	716/1352	4.17	3.97	4.12	3.99	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	348/1248	4.67	3.98	4.23	4.28	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.04	4.39	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	563/1239	4.67	4.22	4.45	4.57	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	161/906	4.67	3.93	4.13	4.08	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	ENEE 691 01
Title:	Special Topics Elec Engr
Instructor:	Adali, Tulay

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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