

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	441/1447	4.64	4.42	4.31	4.31	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	920/1447	4.18	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	505/1241	4.55	4.15	4.33	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	567/1402	4.44	4.04	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.12	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	812/1316	4.00	3.87	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	751/1427	4.27	3.95	4.19	4.14	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.91	4.64	4.69	4.70	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	797/1434	4.10	4.19	4.10	3.97	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1023/1387	4.27	4.34	4.46	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1304/1387	4.09	4.63	4.73	4.71	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1010/1386	4.09	4.06	4.32	4.24	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	946/1380	4.18	3.94	4.32	4.30	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	526/1193	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.71	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	3.78	4.35	4.30	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1013/1170	3.67	3.81	4.38	4.32	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	4.48	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.11	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.30	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.28	4.33	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	640/1447	4.47	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	3	3.73	1235/1447	3.73	4.22	4.27	4.23	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1116/1241	3.60	4.15	4.33	4.33	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	1211/1402	3.64	4.04	4.24	4.24	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	881/1358	3.93	4.01	4.11	4.10	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1134/1316	3.50	3.87	4.14	4.13	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	4	4	3.53	1249/1427	3.53	3.95	4.19	4.15	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.64	4.69	4.65	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1223/1434	3.53	4.19	4.10	4.09	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	1085/1387	4.20	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1309/1387	4.07	4.63	4.73	4.71	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	9	2	3.73	1198/1386	3.73	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	8	1	3.53	1237/1380	3.53	3.94	4.32	4.32	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	786/1193	3.86	3.86	4.02	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1042/1172	3.33	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	856/1182	4.00	3.78	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1013/1170	3.67	3.81	4.38	4.49	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	167/ 189	3.80	4.48	4.34	4.26	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	182/ 192	3.40	4.11	4.34	4.20	3.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	176/ 186	3.60	4.30	4.48	4.36	3.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	163/ 187	3.60	4.28	4.33	4.11	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	4.18	4.20	4.02	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CMPE 314 01
 Title Prin Of Electronic Cir
 Instructor: Yan,Li
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 376
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	681/1447	4.43	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	8	4.17	929/1447	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	743/1241	4.30	4.15	4.33	4.33	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	705/1402	4.31	4.04	4.24	4.24	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	736/1358	4.12	4.01	4.11	4.10	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	710/1316	4.15	3.87	4.14	4.13	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	8	8	3.87	1103/1427	3.87	3.95	4.19	4.15	3.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	436/1447	4.91	4.64	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	4	10	7	3.96	916/1434	3.96	4.19	4.10	4.09	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	670/1387	4.59	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	1063/1387	4.59	4.63	4.73	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1030/1386	4.05	4.06	4.32	4.30	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	0	7	12	4.14	978/1380	4.14	3.94	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	493/1193	4.24	3.86	4.02	4.05	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1182	****	3.78	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1170	****	3.81	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	7	5	4	3.81	165/ 189	3.81	4.48	4.34	4.26	3.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	2	6	6	2	3.50	178/ 192	3.50	4.11	4.34	4.20	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	157/ 186	4.06	4.30	4.48	4.36	4.06
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	124/ 187	4.25	4.28	4.33	4.11	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	139/ 168	3.75	4.18	4.20	4.02	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 315 01
 Title Prin VLSI Design
 Instructor: Patel,Chintan
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 377
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.15	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.04	4.24	4.24	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.01	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	617/1316	4.25	3.87	4.14	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1427	4.17	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1301/1447	4.17	4.64	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.19	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.63	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	549/1380	4.60	3.94	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	376/1193	4.40	3.86	4.02	4.05	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	881/1172	3.75	3.71	4.15	4.24	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.75	3.78	4.35	4.42	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	3.81	4.38	4.49	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	3.67	4.06	4.12	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.26	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	147/ 192	4.00	4.11	4.34	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	174/ 186	3.67	4.30	4.48	4.36	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	114/ 187	4.33	4.28	4.33	4.11	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	73/ 168	4.33	4.18	4.20	4.02	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 320 1
 Title Prob, Stat, & Random P
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 378
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	13	21	4.49	612/1447	4.49	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	11	22	4.46	604/1447	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	14	17	4.30	750/1241	4.30	4.15	4.33	4.33	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	3	13	15	4.39	635/1402	4.39	4.04	4.24	4.24	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	2	4	12	8	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	4	8	13	4.23	635/1316	4.23	3.87	4.14	4.13	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	15	18	4.38	632/1427	4.38	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	30	4.81	727/1447	4.81	4.64	4.69	4.65	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	25	4.63	262/1434	4.63	4.19	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	14	17	4.27	1023/1387	4.27	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	553/1387	4.89	4.63	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	15	17	4.30	847/1386	4.30	4.06	4.32	4.30	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	11	20	4.42	749/1380	4.42	3.94	4.32	4.32	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	5	9	17	4.31	433/1193	4.31	3.86	4.02	4.05	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	****/1182	****	3.78	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	****/1170	****	3.81	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	28	3	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 34	Graduate 0 Major 32
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 38 Non-major 6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 11	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

Course-Section: CMPE 330 1
 Title Em Waves Transmission
 Instructor: Menyuk, Curtis R
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 379
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	1118/1447	3.94	4.42	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	6	4	3.82	1196/1447	3.82	4.22	4.27	4.23	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.15	4.33	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	7	2	3.47	1270/1402	3.47	4.04	4.24	4.24	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1015/1358	3.77	4.01	4.11	4.10	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	5	4	3	3.18	1239/1316	3.18	3.87	4.14	4.13	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	6	4	3.82	1130/1427	3.82	3.95	4.19	4.15	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.88	4.64	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	9	7	0	3.44	1265/1434	3.44	4.19	4.10	4.09	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	829/1387	4.47	4.34	4.46	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.63	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	6	3	3.75	1191/1386	3.75	4.06	4.32	4.30	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	4	5	4	3.53	1240/1380	3.53	3.94	4.32	4.32	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	6	2	6	3.69	884/1193	3.69	3.86	4.02	4.05	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1182	****	3.78	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1170	****	3.81	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 422 1
 Title Digital Signal Process
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 380
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	723/1447	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	658/1241	4.40	4.15	4.33	4.41	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.04	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.01	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	812/1316	4.00	3.87	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1144/1427	3.80	3.95	4.19	4.20	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.64	4.69	4.72	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.19	4.10	4.17	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.63	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	549/1380	4.60	3.94	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	526/1193	4.20	3.86	4.02	4.00	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	3.78	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	3.81	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 451 01
 Title Capstone II
 Instructor: Pinkston,John T
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 381
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	551/1447	4.54	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	872/1447	4.23	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1241	****	4.15	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1056/1402	3.92	4.04	4.24	4.34	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1358	****	4.01	4.11	4.15	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	4	2	3.54	1120/1316	3.54	3.87	4.14	4.27	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	4	3	2	3.33	1312/1427	3.33	3.95	4.19	4.20	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	819/1447	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.72	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	290/1434	4.58	4.19	4.10	4.17	4.58

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	941/1387	4.36	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	758/1387	4.82	4.63	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	863/1386	4.27	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	1	4	3.36	1278/1380	3.36	3.94	4.32	4.34	3.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	843/1193	3.75	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.75

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	3.71	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	3.78	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	3.81	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate	0	Major	13	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 2						

Course-Section: CMPE 491 2
 Title Spec Topic In Comp Eng
 Instructor: Mohammadpourrad
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 382
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1159/1447	4.24	4.42	4.31	4.43	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	1	3.80	1210/1447	4.11	4.22	4.27	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1096/1241	3.67	4.15	4.33	4.41	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	976/1402	4.40	4.04	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	663/1358	4.35	4.01	4.11	4.15	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1223/1316	3.96	3.87	4.14	4.27	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	906/1427	4.48	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1332/1447	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.72	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	754/1434	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.17	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1063/1387	4.33	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1203/1387	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	927/1386	3.96	4.06	4.32	4.34	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1270/1380	3.63	3.94	4.32	4.34	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	991/1193	3.50	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	881/1172	3.71	3.71	4.15	4.25	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1078/1182	4.08	3.78	4.35	4.49	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	988/1170	4.21	3.81	4.38	4.51	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 2	Major 9	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0				
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	1		
				? 0				

Course-Section: CMPE 491 3
 Title Spec Topic In Comp Eng
 Instructor: Carter, Gary M
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 383
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	507/1447	4.24	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	648/1447	4.11	4.22	4.27	4.31	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1096/1241	3.67	4.15	4.33	4.41	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.40	4.04	4.24	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	345/1358	4.35	4.01	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	3.96	3.87	4.14	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	120/1427	4.48	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	849/1434	4.07	4.19	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	881/1387	4.33	4.34	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.63	4.63	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1205/1386	3.96	4.06	4.32	4.34	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1128/1380	3.63	3.94	4.32	4.34	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	936/1193	3.50	3.86	4.02	4.00	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	925/1172	3.71	3.71	4.15	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.08	3.78	4.35	4.49	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.21	3.81	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.67	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	695/1447	4.43	4.42	4.31	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	824/1447	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1161/1241	3.43	4.15	4.33	4.38	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1107/1402	3.86	4.04	4.24	4.29	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	452/1358	4.40	4.01	4.11	4.26	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	671/1316	4.20	3.87	4.14	4.34	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.95	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1301/1447	4.17	4.64	4.69	4.74	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	431/1434	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.21	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.34	4.46	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.63	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	855/1386	4.29	4.06	4.32	4.43	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1380	4.29	3.94	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	927/1193	3.60	3.86	4.02	4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	559/1172	4.29	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	968/1182	3.86	3.78	4.35	4.46	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	827/1170	4.14	3.81	4.38	4.52	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	3.67	4.06	4.10	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 189	4.75	4.48	4.34	4.82	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	132/ 192	4.25	4.11	4.34	4.79	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.30	4.48	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	98/ 187	4.50	4.28	4.33	4.67	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	47/ 168	4.50	4.18	4.20	4.55	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 650 1
 Title Digital Systems
 Instructor: Robucci,Ryan W
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 385
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1198/1447	3.86	4.42	4.31	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1175/1447	3.86	4.22	4.27	4.30	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	634/1241	4.43	4.15	4.33	4.38	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1379/1402	2.83	4.04	4.24	4.29	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1244/1358	3.29	4.01	4.11	4.26	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1134/1316	3.50	3.87	4.14	4.34	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1347/1427	3.17	3.95	4.19	4.25	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1234/1447	4.29	4.64	4.69	4.74	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1188/1434	3.60	4.19	4.10	4.21	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1340/1387	3.17	4.34	4.46	4.51	3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1362/1387	3.50	4.63	4.73	4.81	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	1290/1386	3.33	4.06	4.32	4.43	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1284/1380	3.33	3.94	4.32	4.38	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	3.86	4.02	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1150/1172	2.67	3.71	4.15	4.32	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1178/1182	2.00	3.78	4.35	4.46	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1169/1170	2.00	3.81	4.38	4.52	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	782/ 800	2.50	3.67	4.06	4.10	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	87/ 189	4.50	4.48	4.34	4.82	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	89/ 192	4.50	4.11	4.34	4.79	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	104/ 186	4.50	4.30	4.48	4.73	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	141/ 187	4.00	4.28	4.33	4.67	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	150/ 168	3.50	4.18	4.20	4.55	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 691 2
 Title Spec Top In Cmpe
 Instructor: Robucci,Ryan W
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 386
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.15	4.33	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.00	4.01	4.11	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.95	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.64	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.19	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.34	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.63	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.06	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	3.94	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.86	4.02	4.02	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.48	4.34	4.82	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.11	4.34	4.79	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.30	4.48	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 187	5.00	4.28	4.33	4.67	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 168	5.00	4.18	4.20	4.55	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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