Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN

Baltimore County

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 355

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	3.88	4.23	4.29	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	893/1249	4.00	3.88	4.27	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1160/1424	3.80	3.82	4.21	4.28	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1396	****	3.63	3.98	3.94	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	3.78	4.07	4.05	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1228/1459	3.60	3.65	4.16	4.17	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.20	4.68	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1307/1450	3.25	3.76	4.09	4.15	3.25
Tarkuna														
Lecture	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	4 00	1152/1409	4 00	1 21	4 40	4 47	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	T	3	3	4.00	614/1407	4.00 4.86	4.34 4.54	4.42	4.47 4.78	4.00 4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	Ţ	6		1237/1399	3.50	3.82	4.69	4.78	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	1		1017/1400	4.00	3.84	4.25	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		•	-	U T		0	4							
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	U	2	4	1	3.86	726/1179	3.86	3.62	3.96	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.80	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1027/1259	3.80	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.68	4.30	4.28	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.75	4.00	3.98	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	155/ 246	4.00	3.74	4.20	4.51	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	216/ 249	3.33	3.25	4.11	4.32	3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	242/ 242	1.33	3.50	4.40	4.63	1.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	161/ 240	4.00	3.76	4.20	4.58	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 217	****	3.91	4.04	4.28	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 356 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	<b>;</b>		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	1	7		1193/1481			4.29	4.29	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	3	2		1420/1481	3.04	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	5	2		1157/1249		3.88	4.27	4.28	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	6	2		1327/1424		3.82	4.21	4.27	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	4	3		1059/1396	3.49	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	1	4	3		1140/1342	3.29	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	5	1			1400/1459		3.65	4.16	4.17	2.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	5	5	2		1454/1480		4.20	4.68	4.65	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1425/1450	2.82	3.76	4.09	4.10	2.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1293/1409	3.79	4.34	4.42	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	4	5	3		1372/1407	3.76	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	2	2		1325/1399	2.98	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	1	3		1330/1400		3.90	4.27	4.28	2.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	1	1	0	4		1087/1179			3.96	4.02	
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	4	3	3.21	1089/1262	3.39	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	4	5	2	1	2.71	1217/1259	3.17	3.76	4.29	4.34	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	5	3	4	1	1	2.29	1237/1256	3.17	3.68	4.30	4.34	2.29
4. Were special techniques successful	0	11	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	232/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.20	3.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	243/ 249		3.25	4.11	4.23	2.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	225/ 242		3.50	4.40	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	161/ 240	3.63	3.76	4.20		4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	163/ 217	4.00	3.91	4.04		3.57
or more requirements for tax reports oreary specifical	•	ŭ	_	ŭ	_	_	_	3.37	103, 21,	1.00	3.71	1.01		3.37
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.00	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 63	****	4.00	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 69	****	4.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.43	****
Field Work														
Field work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13 13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.13	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation		0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0		0	0	0		****/ 41	****	4.00	4.26	3.90	****
	13	U	U	1	U	U	U	∠.00	^^^/ 41		4.00	4.40	3.90	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13 13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 13 ?

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0102

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 11

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 357 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionn	aire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	928/1481	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1380/1481	3.04	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	1	1	2.73	1221/1249	3.08	3.88	4.27	4.28	2.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	959/1424	3.56	3.82	4.21	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1167/1396	3.49	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	1248/1342	3.29	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	1	3.00	1380/1459	2.86	3.65	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	4	3	1	3.09	1466/1480	3.22	4.20	4.68	4.65	3.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	7	3	0	3.09	1344/1450	2.82	3.76	4.09	4.10	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1152/1409	3.79	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1324/1407	3.76	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	3	1	2	3.00	1325/1399	2.98	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	4	3	3.64	1193/1400	3.24	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	3	0	4	1	3.11	1035/1179	3.10	3.62	3.96	4.02	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	862/1262	3.39	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1094/1259	3.17	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1059/1256	3.17	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.07	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	144/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.20	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	204/ 249	2.94	3.25	4.11	4.23	3.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	213/ 242	3.62	3.50	4.40	4.36	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	193/ 240	3.63	3.76	4.20	3.96	3.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	66/ 217		3.91	4.04	4.11	4.50
	=	_		-	_	_	_							
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.00	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 69	****	4.00	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 63	****	4.00	4.44	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 69	****	4.00	4.35	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68	****	4.00	3.92	4.43	****
		-	-	-	-	_	-		, 00				5	
_														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0103

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 358 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

				-	ncies				tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	1069/1481	4.01	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	4	4	0	2.86	1448/1481	3.04	3.88	4.23	4.23	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	2	6	1	3.21	1171/1249	3.08	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1303/1424	3.56	3.82	4.21	4.27	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1025/1396	3.49	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1195/1342	3.29	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	6	1	1	2.64	1421/1459	2.86	3.65	4.16	4.17	2.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	2	6	5	0	3.07	1466/1480	3.22	4.20	4.68	4.65	3.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1398/1450	2.82	3.76	4.09	4.10	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1228/1409	3.79	4.34	4.42	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1331/1407	3.76	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	6	3	5	0	2.93	1343/1399	2.98	3.82	4.26	4.27	2.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1301/1400	3.24	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	4	5	2	3	3.29	989/1179	3.10	3.62	3.96	4.02	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1113/1262	3.39	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1140/1259	3.17	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1099/1256	3.17	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.07	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	3	0	4	3	2	3.08	239/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.20	3.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	3	1	5	3	0	2.67	244/ 249	2.94	3.25	4.11	4.23	2.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	232/ 242	3.62	3.50	4.40	4.36	3.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	2	6	0	3	3.17	211/ 240	3.63	3.76	4.20	3.96	3.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	8	2	3.92	138/ 217	4.00	3.91	4.04	4.11	3.92

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	3						

Course-Section: CMPE 314 0101

Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR

BOURNER, DAVID

Instructor:

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 14

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 359 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------------------	---------------

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	^	0	1	0	2	_	4	2 06	1102/1401	2.06	4 00	4 00	4 00	2 06
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0 1	3	6	4		1193/1481	3.86	4.28	4.29	4.29	3.86 3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	, 8	3	2		1378/1481	3.29	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	8	1	3		1144/1249 1295/1424	3.36	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3 2	3		1295/1424	3.42	3.82	4.21	4.27	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	1			,		3.78	4.07	4.12	3.14
	1	0	0	3	3 4	<u> </u>	3 1		1060/1342 1327/1459	3.63 3.31	3.78	4.16	4.12	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	U T	0	0	0	0	5 11	_		- ,		4.20		4.17	
<u>.</u>	2	0	1	1	3	6 11			1245/1480 1262/1450		3.76	4.68 4.09	4.05	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	Τ	Τ	3	ь	1	3.42	1262/1450	3.42	3./6	4.09	4.10	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Ο	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	766/1407		4.54	4.69	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	7	1		1231/1399	3.54	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	ρ,	_		1200/1400	3.62	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	3	6	1	3.33			3.62	3.96	4.02	
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			2	U	5	U	_	3.33	J12/1119	3.33	3.02	3.90	1.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1262	****	3.80	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1259	****	3.76	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1256	****	3.68	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.75	4.00	4.07	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	208/ 246	3.57	3.74	4.20	4.20	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	195/ 249	3.57	3.25	4.11	4.23	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	210/ 242	3.86	3.50	4.40	4.36	3.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	209/ 240	3.29	3.76	4.20	3.96	3.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	193/ 217	3.14	3.91	4.04	4.11	3.14
Field Work														
	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 51	++++	4 00	4 00	1 12	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation		0	0	0	1	U	U	3.00	,	****	4.00	4.00	4.13	****
3. was the instructor available for consultation	13	U	U	U	Τ	0	U	3.00	****/ 36	^ ^ ~	4.00	4.60	4.33	^ ^ ^ *
Frequ	ency	nist	trib	ıtioı	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				2	6						

University of Maryland Page 360
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMPE 315 0101

15

PRIN VLSI DESIGN

PATEL, CHINTAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

Questions   NR NA   1   2   3   4   5   Mean   Rank   Mean   Me																		
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the revaluations reflect the expected goals 3. Did the revaluations reflect the expected goals 3. Did the revaluations reflect the expected goals 3. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 4. Did observed the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. 8. 0. 0. 2. 2. 2. 4.00 707/1396 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.07 4.12 4.27 4.58 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Did writer assignments contribute to what you learned 8. 0. 0. 1. 2. 1. 9 4.38 635/1459 4.44 3.65 4.16 4.17 4.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. 0. 0. 1. 2. 1. 9 4.38 635/1459 4.44 3.65 4.16 4.17 4.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. 0. 0. 1. 2. 1. 9 4.38 635/1459 4.44 3.65 4.16 4.17 4.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2. 0. 0. 1. 1. 3. 7 4.33 546/1450 4.17 3.76 4.09 4.10 4.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 3. 10 4.64 588/1409 4.82 4.34 4.42 4.63 4.6 8. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 1. 3. 4.93 400/1407 4.96 4.54 4.69 4.67 4.9 8. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 1. 3. 4.93 400/1407 4.96 4.54 4.69 4.67 4.9 8. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 3. 3. 8 862/1262 4.40 3.80 4.05 4.00 4.0 8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course   0			Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			General															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0 0 1 1 2 1 9 4.14 824/1249 4.32 3.88 4.27 4.28 4.1	1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	417/1481	4.32	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.64
1. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 2 2 9 4.54 406/1424 4.27 3.82 4.21 4.27 4.58 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 0 2 2 2 2 4.00 707/1306 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.00 4.05 5.01 dissipped readings contribute to what you learned 1 5 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.25 542/1342 4.13 3.78 4.07 4.12 4.2 4.2 4.84 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear the	expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1000/1481	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 707/1396 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.00 4.0 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5 0 0 1 4 3 4.25 542/1342 4.13 3.78 4.07 4.12 4.2 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 2 1 9 4.38 635/1459 4.44 3.65 4.16 4.17 4.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 2 1 9 4.38 635/1459 4.44 3.65 4.16 4.17 4.3 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 2 1 3 7 3 4.00 1349/1480 4.00 4.20 4.68 4.65 4.0 9 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect th	e expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	824/1249	4.32	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.14
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   1	4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect the	expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	406/1424	4.27	3.82	4.21	4.27	4.54
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   1					0	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.63	3.98	4.00	4.00
1. Ware the grading system clearly explained   1 0 0 0 1 2 1 9 4.38 635/1459 4.44 3.65 4.16 4.17 4.3					1	5	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	542/1342	4.13	3.78	4.07	4.12	4.25
3. How many times was class cancelled			_	_	1	0	0	1	2	1	9							4.38
Lecture  Lec					1	0	0	0	3	7	3							4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 10 4.64 588/1409 4.82 4.34 4.42 4.43 4.68   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 400/1407 4.96 4.54 4.69 4.67 4.79   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 0 2 4 6 3.86 1120/1399 4.18 3.82 4.26 4.27 3.8   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 4 2 6 3.71 1165/1400 4.11 3.90 4.27 4.28 3.7   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 526/1179 3.32 3.62 3.96 4.02 4.1    Discussion  1. Discussion  2. Discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 862/1262 4.40 3.80 4.05 4.14 3.8   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 1027/1259 3.90 3.76 4.29 4.34 3.8   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 984/1256 3.70 3.68 4.30 4.34 3.9   3. Were repeated techniques successful 5 6 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ***** / 788 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.07 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.6   3. Were recessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.04 4.33 4.5   3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.04 4.34 4.3   4.67 4.79 4.20 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.79 4.04 4.31 4.1   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/240 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.36 4.34   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.36 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20						-	-	-		-								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 10 4.64 588/1409 4.82 4.34 4.42 4.43 4.68   2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 400/1407 4.96 4.54 4.69 4.67 4.79   3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 0 2 4 6 3.86 1120/1399 4.18 3.82 4.26 4.27 3.8   4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 4 2 6 3.71 1165/1400 4.11 3.90 4.27 4.28 3.7   5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 526/1179 3.32 3.62 3.96 4.02 4.1    Discussion  1. Discussion  2. Discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 862/1262 4.40 3.80 4.05 4.14 3.8   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 1027/1259 3.90 3.76 4.29 4.34 3.8   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 984/1256 3.70 3.68 4.30 4.34 3.9   3. Were repeated techniques successful 5 6 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ***** / 788 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.07 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.6   3. Were recessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.04 4.33 4.5   3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.04 4.34 4.3   4.67 4.79 4.20 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.79 4.04 4.31 4.1   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/240 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.36 4.34   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.36 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20			Togturo															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 13 4,93 400/1407 4.96 4.54 4.69 4.67 4.9 4.8 8. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 0 2 4 6 3.86 1120/1399 4.18 3.82 4.26 4.27 3.8 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	1 Word +	ho inatr		ll propared	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	1	2	1.0	1 61	E00/1/00	1 02	1 21	1 12	1 12	1 61
8. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 0 2 4 6 3.86 1120/1399 4.18 3.82 4.26 4.27 3.8 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 4 2 6 3.71 1165/1400 4.11 3.90 4.27 4.28 3.7 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 526/1179 3.32 3.62 3.96 4.02 4.1 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 862/1262 4.40 3.80 4.05 4.14 3.8 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.80 1027/1259 3.90 3.76 4.29 4.34 3.8 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 984/1256 3.70 3.68 4.30 4.07 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 57/ 246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.6 S. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/ 249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5 S. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/ 242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 S. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/ 242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  One 27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors O Graduate O Major O 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 S. Septiment of the majors O Graduate O Major O 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 S. Septiment O C C 2 General O Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 O C 2 General O Under-grad 14 Non-major 1							-	-	_	_			,					
1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 4 2 6 3.71 1165/1400 4.11 3.90 4.27 4.28 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 526/1179 3.32 3.62 3.96 4.02 4.11 Discussion  1. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 862/1262 4.40 3.80 4.05 4.14 3.8   2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 1027/1259 3.90 3.76 4.29 4.34 3.8   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.80 1027/1259 3.90 3.76 4.29 4.34 3.8   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 984/1256 3.70 3.68 4.30 4.34 3.9   4. Were special techniques successful 5 6 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.07 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.6   2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1    Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  One-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0   28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6   56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1   84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					-			-	-									
Discussion  Discus			_	_				-										
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 862/1262 4.40 3.80 4.05 4.14 3.8  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 1027/1259 3.90 3.76 4.29 4.34 3.8  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 984/1256 3.70 3.68 4.30 4.34 3.9  4. Were special techniques successful 5 6 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 788 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.07 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/ 246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.6  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/ 249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/ 242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/ 242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/ 217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1  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 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0				-							-							
Laboratory  Labora	5. Did au	idiovisua.	I techniques enhanc	e your understanding	0	Ü	0	Т	3	3	7	4.14	526/1179	3.32	3.62	3.96	4.02	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 1027/1259 3.90 3.76 4.29 4.34 3.8   3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 984/1256 3.70 3.68 4.30 4.34 3.9   4. Were special techniques successful 5 6 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 *****/ 788 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.07 ***  Laboratory  Lab																		
8. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 984/1256 3.70 3.68 4.30 4.34 3.94 4.84 Were special techniques successful 5 6 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 ****/ 788 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.07 ***  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/ 246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.62 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/ 249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5 3.8 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/ 242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 154/ 240 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/ 217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1  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 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					4	0			3	2	4	3.80	862/1262	4.40	3.80	4.05	4.14	3.80
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.6 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1  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 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 6 6 6-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					4	0	_	0	3	2	4	3.80	1027/1259	3.90	3.76	4.29	4.34	3.80
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.6 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 154/240 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage fair	and open discussion	4	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	984/1256	3.70	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.90
L. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 57/246 4.33 3.74 4.20 4.20 4.62 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5   B. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1   B. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1   B. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1    Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  OO-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6    56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	4. Were s	special to	echniques successfu	1	5	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 788	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 1 0 2 2 3.50 196/ 249 3.75 3.25 4.11 4.23 3.5 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/ 242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 154/ 240 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/ 217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1    Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0			Laboratory	•														
8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 d. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 154/240 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1 d. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d	1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understandin	g of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	57/ 246	4.33	3.74	4.20	4.20	4.67
8. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 175/242 4.33 3.50 4.40 4.36 4.1 d. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 154/240 4.08 3.76 4.20 3.96 4.1 d. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 118/217 4.33 3.91 4.04 4.11 4.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d.1 d	2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequate b	ackground information	8	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	196/ 249	3.75	3.25	4.11	4.23	3.50
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 0 Major 028-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 184-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0					8	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	175/ 242	4.33	3.50	4.40	4.36	4.17
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 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provide as	sistance	8	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	154/ 240	4.08	3.76	4.20	3.96	4.17
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0			-		8	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	118/ 217	4.33	3.91	4.04	4.11	4.17
00-27				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
00-27								_					_					
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5 			Ту 	pe 			Majors 	; 
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 1 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	00-27					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0	28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0		_													
	56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	1			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough	84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	D 0														
	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	յh			

Other

14

Ρ

I

?

0

0

2

Course-Section: CMPE 315 0102 University of Maryland PRIN VLSI DESIGN Baltimore County

Title Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 361

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	2		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	MP	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
<u> </u>			- 											
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	1069/1481	4.32	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1481	4.25	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.32		4.27	4.28	4.50
		0	0	0	-	2	0							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0				0		-		959/1424	4.27		4.21	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.00	707/1396	4.00		3.98	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.00	755/1342	4.13		4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	460/1459	4.44		4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2			1349/1480	4.00	4.20	4.68	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	836/1450	4.17	3.76	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	4.82	4.34	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.54	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.18	3.82	4.26	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.11	3.90	4.27	4.28	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1128/1179	3.32	3.62	3.96	4.02	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	4.40	3.80	4.05	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1259	3.90	3.76	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1106/1256	3.70	3.68	4.30	4.34	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 246	4.33	3.74	4.20	4.20	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	145/ 249	3.75	3.25	4.11	4.23	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	113/ 242	4.33	3.50	4.40	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	161/ 240	4.08	3.76	4.20	3.96	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	66/ 217			4.20	4.11	4.50
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	U	U	U	U	U	1	_	4.50	00/ 21/	4.33	3.91	4.04	4.11	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	54/ 68	4.00	4.00	4.49	4.70	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	58/ 69	4.00	4.00	4.53		4.00
													4.66	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	45/ 63	4.00	4.00	4.44	4.56	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	48/ 69	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.48	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	36/ 68	4.00	4.00	3.92	4.43	4.00
T' 11 T' 1														
Field Work	-	0	•	0	0	-	•	4 00	20/ 50	4 00	4 00	4 20	4 40	4 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 59	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.48	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 51	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.13	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.33	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	25/ 41	4.00	4.00	4.26	3.90	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	44/ 55	4.00	4.00	4.55	4.88	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.75	4.67	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	43/ 51	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.88	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	32/ 34	4.00	4.00	4.83	4.67	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 24	4.00	4.00	4.82	4.67	4.00

Course-Section: CMPE 315 0102
Title PRIN VLSI DESIGN
Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 361 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
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	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 320 0101 University of Maryland Title PROB, STAT, & RANDOM P

Questions

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN

Enrollment: 16 Ouestionnaires: 10

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

Page 362

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	678/1481	4.40	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	884/1481	4.20	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	980/1249	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1424	****	3.82	4.21	4.27	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	0	2.80	1412/1459	2.80	3.65	4.16	4.17	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.20	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	3.76	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1184/1407	4.40	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	883/1399	4.20	3.82	4.26	4.27	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	985/1400	4.10	3.90	4.27	4.28	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.62	3.96	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	****	3.80	4.05	4.14	****

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1259 \*\*\*\* 3.76 4.29 4.34 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 1 <math>5.00 \*\*\*\*/1256 \*\*\*\* 3.68 4.30 4.34 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: CMPE 330 0101 University of Maryland WAVES & TRANSMISSION Baltimore County Spring 2006

Title

Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 4

- ·	 	
	Evaluation	

Page 363

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.28	4.29	4.29	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1205/1481		3.88	4.23	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	3.82	4.21	4.27	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	3.63	3.98	4.00	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1207/1342	3.25	3.78	4.07	4.12	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.65	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.20	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	3.76	4.09	4.10	3.67
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.34	4.42	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1237/1399	3.50	3.82	4.26	4.27	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	3.90	4.27	4.28	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.62	3.96	4.02	4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 416L 0101

Title CAPSTONE COMP ENGR LAB

Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 19

RNER, DAVID Spring 2006

Page 364 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	896/1481	4.21	4.28	4.29	4.45	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	865/1481	4.21	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	1041/1249	3.77	3.88	4.27	4.44	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1094/1424	3.89	3.82	4.21	4.35	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	5	3	3.32	1176/1396	3.32	3.63	3.98	4.09	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	934/1342	3.83	3.78	4.07	4.21	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1250/1459	3.53	3.65	4.16	4.25	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	936/1480	4.68	4.20	4.68	4.74	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	651/1450	4.24	3.76	4.09	4.28	4.24
<u> </u>														
Lecture	1	0	^	1	_	7	0	4 00	1040/1400	4 00	1 2 1	4 40	4 51	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	1	8		1049/1409	4.22	4.34	4.42	4.51	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2 1	0	1	0	4 6	5 7	8	4.24	846/1399 1160/1400	4.24 3.72	3.82	4.26 4.27	4.36	4.24 3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	5	8			651/1179		3.62		4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	2	U	U	5	8	4	3.94	051/11/9	3.94	3.62	3.90	4.07	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1206/1262	2.67	3.80	4.05	4.33	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.76	4.29	4.57	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	3.68	4.30	4.60	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.75	4.00	4.26	****
Laboratory			_	_		_	_		0.001.045					
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	212/ 246	3.50	3.74	4.20	4.45	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	245/ 249	2.60	3.25	4.11	3.87	2.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	229/ 242	3.60	3.50	4.40	4.45	3.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	Τ	2	1	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	3.76	4.20	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 217	****	3.91	4.04	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	4.00	4.30	4.93	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.00	4.00	4.56	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.91	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.26	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.83	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_		_	
				2	1						

#### Course-Section: CMPE 423 0101 University of Maryland Page 365 COMMUNICATION ENGNG Baltimore County

Title JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: THOMAS, JOSEPH Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionn	Ouestionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
---	-----------------	---	----------------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	3.88	4.23	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	5.00	3.88	4.27	4.44	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.78	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.65	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.20	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	3.76	4.09	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.34	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1399	5.00	3.82	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	3.90	4.27	4.38	5.00
Frequ	iencv	Dist	rib	utio	ı									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	7	Expected	d 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	В	0									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	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	1			
				P	0			responses to be significant						
				I	0	Other	1	-	-					
				2	1									

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Spring 2006

Page 366

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did written assignments contribute to what you learned Did up the expected goals Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did up the expected goals Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Did up the expected goals Did the lab increase up the expected goals Did the lab increase understanding of the material Did up the expected goals Did the lab increase understanding of the material Seminar Did the lab increase understanding of the material Seminar Did the lab increase understanding of the material Seminar Did the lab increase understanding of the material Se		Frequence Ouestions NR NA 1 2				ncies 3		_		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect					
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 9 4.46 600/1481 4.46 4.28 4.29 4.2 10 10 the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 4 2 6 4.00 893/1249 4.00 3.88 4.23 4.1 1.0 10 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 4 2 6 6 4.00 893/1249 4.00 3.88 4.27 4.2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			Question	ns 		NK	NA				4		mean	капк 	mean	Mean	mean	mean 	Mear	
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 0 7 4.31 769/1481 4.31 3.88 4.23 4.1   Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 0 7 6 3.92 1061/1424 3.92 3.82 4.21 4.1   Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 2 4 5 3.92 1061/1424 3.92 3.82 4.21 4.1   Did assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 2 4 4 4 4.00 707/1396 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.00   Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 2 0 1 3 3.83 934/1342 3.83 3.78 4.07 4.1   Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 0 9 1 3.75 1439/1480 3.75 4.05 4.65 4.16 4.0   How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 2 0 9 1 3.75 1439/1480 3.75 4.05 4.65 4.7   How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9   Lecture   Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 968/1409 4.33 4.34 4.42 4.3   Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.69 4.7   Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1   Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8    Discussion   Discussion   Discussion   Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 754/1256 4.29 3.68 4.30 4.3   Were special techniques successful    Laboratory   Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2   Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.75 4.00 3.9   Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7   Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 1 1 2 2 3.60 3.00 2.03 8.20 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0			Genera	al																
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 0 7 4.31 769/1481 4.31 3.88 4.23 4.1   Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 0 7 6 3.92 1061/1424 3.92 3.82 4.21 4.1   Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 2 4 5 3.92 1061/1424 3.92 3.82 4.21 4.1   Did assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 2 4 4 4 4.00 707/1396 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.00   Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 2 0 1 3 3.83 934/1342 3.83 3.78 4.07 4.1   Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 0 9 1 3.75 1439/1480 3.75 4.05 4.65 4.16 4.0   How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 2 0 9 1 3.75 1439/1480 3.75 4.05 4.65 4.7   How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9   Lecture   Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 968/1409 4.33 4.34 4.42 4.3   Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.69 4.7   Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1   Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8    Discussion   Discussion   Discussion   Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 754/1256 4.29 3.68 4.30 4.3   Were special techniques successful    Laboratory   Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2   Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.75 4.00 3.9   Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7   Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 1 1 2 2 3.60 3.00 2.03 8.20 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	you ga	ain ne	ew insights,ski	ills from	this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	600/1481	4.46	4.28	4.29	4.28	4.46	
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 4 2 6 4.00 893/1249 4.00 3.88 4.27 4.2 Did cher evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 2 4 5 3.92 1061/1242 4.92 3.92 3.82 4.21 4.1 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 2 0 1 2 4 4 4.00 707/1396 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.07 4.1 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 2 0 1 3 3.83 34/1342 3.83 3.78 4.07 4.1 Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 3 4 3 3.67 1201/1459 3.67 1.65 4.16 4.0 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 2 3 4 3 3.67 1201/1459 3.67 1.65 4.16 4.0 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 2 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Lecture Lecture Lecture Well prepared 1 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 968/1409 4.33 4.34 4.42 4.3 Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 968/1409 4.33 4.34 4.42 4.3 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.65 4.7 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8 Discussion Discussion Discussion Contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.07 4.1 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.29 3.80 4.09 4.3 Were special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9 Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.75 4.20 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.75 4.20 4.2 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 4.2 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 4.2 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 4.2 Did the la			0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	769/1481	4.31	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.31				
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 2 4 4 5 3.92 1061/1424 3.92 3.82 4.21 4.1 bid assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 2 4 4 4.00 707/1395 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.0 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 2 0 1 3 3.83 394/1342 3.83 3.78 4.07 4.1 Nas the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 0 1 3 3.83 394/1342 3.83 3.78 4.07 4.1 Nas the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 0 9 1 3.75 1439/1480 3.75 4.20 4.68 4.7 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 1 1 3 7 4.33 968/1409 4.03 3.43 4.34 4.42 4.3 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.69 4.7 Now would you grade the overall presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 2 4 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.03 4.3 Now work of the propose of the participate 6 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.03 4.3 Now work of the propose of the participa								0	1	4	2	6	4.00			3.88	4.27	4.24	4.00	
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 2 4 4 4.00 707/1396 4.00 3.63 3.98 4.01 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7 0 2 0 1 3 3.83 934/1342 3.83 3.78 4.07 4.10 Mas the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 3 4 3 3.67 1201/1459 3.67 3.65 4.16 4.0 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 2 0 9 1 3.75 1439/1480 3.75 4.20 4.68 4.7 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9 Lecture  Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 968/1409 4.33 4.34 4.42 4.3 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.69 4.7 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8 Discussion 5.00 Contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 651/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 651/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.09 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 Were special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.03 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9 Were special techniques successful 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2 4.3 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.75 4.00 3.9 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 1 1 3.60 217/246 3.40 3.75 4.00 3.9 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 2.0 1 3.0 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 1 2 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.9 4.2 Frequency Distribution  **Seminar**  Were eassigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.9 4.2 Frequency Distribution  **Frequency Distrib								0	2	2	4							4.16	3.92	
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   0									_	_	_	_		,					4.00	
. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 3 4 3 3.67 1201/1459 3.67 3.65 4.16 4.0 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 2 0 9 1 3.75 1439/1480 3.75 4.20 4.68 4.7 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 7 3 4.09 786/1450 4.09 3.76 4.09 3.9    Lecture								-	_	_	_	_		. ,					3.8	
How many times was class cancelled								-		•	_	_		,					3.6	
Lecture   Lect	_				.nea		-	-	_	-	_	_		- ,						
Lecture  . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  . Did the lab increase understanding of the material  . Were special techniques successful  . Did the lab increase understanding of the material  . Were you provided with adequate background information  . Were necessary materials available for lab activities  . Did the lab instructor provide assistance  . B 2 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.75 4.20 4.2  . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  . Did the lab instructor provide assistance  . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2   **Frequency Distribution**  **Graduate 7 Major**  **Major**  **August 4.20 4.2 Under-grad 6 Non-majo**  **Major**  **Did the lab instructor provide assistance as a 2 Under-grad 6 Non-majo**  **Major**  **Frequency Distribution**  **Frequency Distribution**  **Freq	_									-		_		,					3.7	
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 968/1409 4.33 4.34 4.42 4.3 . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.69 4.7 . Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1 . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 5 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1 . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 . Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3 . Were special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9  Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2 . Were pour provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9 . Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 . Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1 . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 . Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1 . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Readits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Major  Adjor  Major  Prequency Distribution  Readits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Major  Readits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Major  Prequency Distribution  Readits Earned  Cum. GPA  Expected Grades  Reasons  Type  Major  Major  Prequency Distribution	would	ı you g	grade the overa	all teach	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	Τ	U	7	3	4.09	786/1450	4.09	3.76	4.09	3.96	4.0	
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.69 4.7   Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1   Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1   Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8    Discussion  Discussion  Discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3   Were special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9    Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2   Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9   Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.00 4.2   Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1   Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7    Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2    Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Frequency Distribution  Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Frequency Distribution    Gandate 7 Major    Major    General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major    Non-major    Major    General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major    Non-major    Did the instructor activates a contribute a cont			Lectui	re																
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.62 4.54 4.69 4.7   Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1   Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1   Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8    Discussion  Discussion  Discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3   Were special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9    Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2   Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9   Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.00 4.2   Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1   Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7    Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2    Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Frequency Distribution  Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Frequency Distribution    Gandate 7 Major    Major    General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major    Non-major    Major    General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major    Non-major    Did the instructor activates a contribute a cont	the i	instr	uctor's lecture	es well p	repared	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.34	4.42	4.36	4.3	
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 2 5 5 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 3.82 4.26 4.1 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 5 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8    Discussion  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 754/1256 4.29 3.68 4.30 4.3 Were special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9    Laboratory . Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 **** / 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1   . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7    Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2    Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Frequency Distribution    Frequency D						0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1019/1407	4.62	4.54	4.69	4.73	4.6	
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 0 5 6 4.08 994/1400 4.08 3.90 4.27 4.1 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 2 1 3 6 4.08 563/1179 4.08 3.62 3.96 3.8 Discussion  Discussion  Discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 5 4.0 6.0 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 61/1259 6.4 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0					_	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	3.82	4.26	4.16	4.0	
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 5.0 4.0 5.0 4.0 5.0 4.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6									1									4.17	4.0	
Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 754/1256 4.29 3.68 4.30 4.3 Were special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 394/ 788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9  Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/ 246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/ 249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/ 242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 **** 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.2 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 2 2 1 3.60 163/ 217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7  Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major								_												
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 550/1262 4.29 3.80 4.05 4.0   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 0.03 94/788 4.00 3.76 4.29 4.3   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 2 4.00 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9    Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2   Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9   Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2   Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1   Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7    Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2    Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Provided Farmed Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major    Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major    Regulated for Majors 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major    Required for Major 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 2 Under-grad 6	auaiov	VISUA.	i teciniiques ei	illalice yo	di diderstanding	1	U	U	۷	_	3	0	4.00	303/11/9	4.00	3.02	3.90	3.61	4.0	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 661/1259 4.43 3.76 4.29 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 754/1256 4.29 3.68 4.30 4.3 Event special techniques successful 6 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 394/788 4.00 3.75 4.00 3.9   Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2 Ever you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9 Ever encessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1 Ever requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7   Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2   Frequency Distribution  Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major Application Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major 20-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 2 Expected Grades Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 20-27 1 0.00-1.99 0 B 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-27 1 0.00-1.99 0 B 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-28 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-28 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-29 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-29 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-29 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-29 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major 20-20 2 Non-major 20-20																				
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 754/1256 4.29 3.68 4.30 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.3	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	2	1	4	4.29	550/1262	4.29	3.80	4.05	4.07	4.2	
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/ 246 3.40 3.75 4.00 3.9  Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/ 249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9  Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/ 242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2  Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1  Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 2 1 3.60 163/ 217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7  Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major  28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2  56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-majo	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	661/1259	4.43	3.76	4.29	4.30	4.4	
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/ 246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/ 249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/ 242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/ 217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7  Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-majo	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	754/1256	4.29	3.68	4.30	4.33	4.2	
Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/ 246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2   Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/ 249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9   Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/ 242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2   Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1   Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/ 217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7    Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2    Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GFA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major 100-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 Under-grad 6 Non-majo	speci	cial to	echniques succe	essful		6	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.75	75 4.00 3.97			
Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 217/ 246 3.40 3.74 4.20 4.2   Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/ 249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9   Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/ 242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2   Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1   Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/ 217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7    Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2    Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GFA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major 100-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 Under-grad 6 Non-majo			Labora	atory																
. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 0 3 2 0 3.40 206/ 249 3.40 3.25 4.11 3.9 . Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/ 242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2 . Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1 . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/ 217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7 . Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2 . Frequency Distribution . Frequency Distribution . Tredits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major . One of the control of the							Λ	Ω	1	2	1	1	3 40	217/ 246	3 40	3 74	4 20	4 27	3.4	
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2  . Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1  . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7   Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2   Frequency Distribution   redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major   00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major  28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2  56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major   20 3.20 238/242 3.20 3.50 4.40 4.2   3.70 4.20 4.11 1 0 3.00 *****/240 ***** 3.76 4.20 4.11   3.70 4.00 *****/68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2   4.70 4.49 4.20 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 4.49 4.20   4.70 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 *****/4.00 ****/4.00 *****/4.00 ***/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ***/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ****/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.00 ***/4.							-	<u> </u>	_		_		,					3.4		
Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 2 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 3.76 4.20 4.1   . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 163/ 217 3.60 3.91 4.04 3.7    Seminar  . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2    Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2   56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major	· · ·								-											
Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major	-									_	_			,					3.2	
Seminar . Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major			_					-			_	-		,					***	
. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49 4.2  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major	requi	ireme	nts for lab rep	ports cle	early specified	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	163/ 217	3.60	3.91	4.04	3.73	3.6	
Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major  00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major			Semina	ar																
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Major 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 7 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-major	assig	gned i	topics relevant	t to the	announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.49				4.23	***			
00-27					Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
00-27	Forms		Cham CD		Ermostad Crados				Do	2022				т.	<b></b>			Mojere		
28-55	Earne		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons								1y	pe 			Majors 	; 	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 6 Non-majo	_	_		-			Required for Majors					3	1	Graduat	е	7	Majo	or	0	
	-	-	1.00-1.99	-																
	C	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-grad 6 Non-m					0	
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0	1	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0															
Grad. 7 $3.50-4.00$ 6 F 0 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not eno	7	7	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>j</sub> h	
P 0 responses to be significant					P 0													_		
I 0 Other 10							Ot.	her				1	.0			5				
					_ *		00.					_	-							

Course-Section: CMPE 650 0101

Title DIGITAL SYSTEMS Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13 Course-Section: CMPE 691C 0101 Title SPEC TOP IN CMPE Instructor:

Tehranipoor, Mo

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 367 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		MD	Frequencies NA 1 2 3 4 5						Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescions			IVA						Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							2	2	4	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.28	4.29	4.28	4.25
	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	2	2	4	4.25	822/1481		3.88	4.23	4.11	4.25
	_	estions reflect the		0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	893/1249		3.88	4.27	4.24	4.00
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0 1	2	0	6	4.50	437/1424		3.82	4.21	4.16	4.50
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							1	0	4	4.17	584/1396		3.63	3.98	4.00	4.17
		_	-	0	0	0	1 1	1 1	1 2	5 4	4.25	542/1342		3.78	4.07	4.18	4.25
	7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	4	4	4.13	890/1459 1044/1480		3.65 4.20	4.16	4.01	4.13 4.50
	_		aching effectiveness	0 2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	334/1450		3.76	4.08	3.96	4.50
9. HOW WO	uid you g	rade the overall te	aching effectiveness	۷	U	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	334/1450	4.50	3.70	4.09	3.90	4.50
		Lecture															
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						1	1	0	6	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.34	4.42	4.36	4.38
		tor seem interested	_	0	0	0	0	1	2	5		1107/1407		4.54	4.69	4.73	4.50
		erial presented and	_	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	713/1399		3.82	4.26	4.16	4.38
		s contribute to wha	-	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	591/1400		3.90	4.27	4.17	4.50
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.62	3.96	3.81	4.50
		Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	3	3	4.29	550/1262	4.29	3.80	4.05	4.07	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	764/1259		3.76	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				1	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	658/1256	4.43	3.68	4.30	4.33	4.43
4. Were s	4. Were special techniques successful				3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.75	4.00	3.97	3.50
		Laboratory															
1. Did the	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	3.74	4.20	4.27	****
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	***	4.00	4.30	4.01	***
	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria				0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	***	4.00	4.00	3.81	***
3. Was the	e instruc	tor available for c	onsultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60 4.65		****
4. To wha	t degree	could you discuss y	our evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.00	4.26	4.27	***
			Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 11. =	,	a ana					_					_					
Credits E	arnea 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons							ту	pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	А б		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1				-								_		_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		General 3 Under-grad 4									4	Non-	-major	0
84-150 Grad.	4	3.00-3.49 3 3.50-4.00 4								0	#### -	Means +	here -	re not	enous	rh	
Grau.	4	3.30-4.00 4	P 0		E-I	ECLI	veb				U					_	111
			I 0		O+1	her					5	responses to be significant					
			? 1		00.						-						