PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. A)

?

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 21

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 307 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	5	8	2	5	3.24	1420/1504	3.24	4.46	4.27	4.26	3.24
		tor make clear			0	0	5	6	4	3	3		1472/1503	2.67	4.15	4.20	4.18	2.67
		estions reflec		=	0	0	8	5	4	2	2		1282/1290	2.29	3.92	4.28	4.27	2.29
	_	ations reflect			0	5	5	6	3	1	1		1447/1453	2.19	4.11	4.21	4.20	2.19
				what you learned	1	5	8	4	2	0	1		1419/1421	1.80	3.87	4.00	3.90	1.80
				to what you learned	0	4	5	3	6	2	1		1349/1365	2.47	3.92	4.08	4.00	2.47
		system clearl			0	0	4	6	5	3	3		1425/1485	2.76	4.00	4.16	4.15	2.76
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	20		329/1504	4.95	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.95
	-			ching effectiveness	4	0	12	3	0	2	0		1482/1483	2.18	4.00	4.06		2.18
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instru	ictor's lecture		prepared	0	0	2	3	4	4	8	3.62	1288/1425	3.62	4.52	4.41	4.40	3.62
		tor seem inter			0	0	2	2	4	3	10		1361/1426	3.81	4.74	4.69	4.71	3.81
				explained clearly	1	0	3	6	3	2	6		1324/1418	3.10	4.23	4.25	4.22	3.10
		es contribute t			3	0	3	4	3	4	4		1316/1416	3.11	4.29	4.26	4.24	3.11
				our understanding	1	2	5	4	3	2	4		1113/1199		4.22	3.97		2.78
		1	2															
		Discus				_	_	_	_									
				what you learned	2	0	9	2	6	1	1		1285/1312		3.76	4.00	3.98	2.11
				ed to participate	2	0	7	5	5	1	1		1268/1303	2.16	3.93	4.24	4.23	2.16
				nd open discussion	2	0	11	3	4	0			1278/1299	1.79	3.97	4.25	4.21	
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	ssiul		2	13	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	746/ 758	2.33	3.01	4.01	3.89	2.33
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	nding o	of the material	15	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.50	3.69	4.09	4.30	3.50
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	15	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	3.73	4.09	4.24	3.00
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	158/ 227	4.33	4.36	4.40	4.58	4.33
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance	15	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.00	4.43	4.23	4.52	4.00
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	15	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	157/ 207	3.67	3.89	4.09	4.22	3.67
		Semina	r															
2. Was th	ne instruc		_	lividual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	***	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
				Frequ	encv	nia	trib	ut i or	1									
				_	сттсу	בדים		ac101	-									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 1		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				Ι 0		Ot	her				1	./						

Baltimore County

PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. B)

Laboratory

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

Title

University of Maryland Spring 2005

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 308 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

1 3.50 190/ 233 3.50 3.69 4.09 4.30 3.50 1 3.00 224/ 244 3.00 3.73 4.09 4.24 3.00

3 4.33 158/ 227 4.33 4.36 4.40 4.58 4.33

2 4.00 153/ 225 4.00 4.43 4.23 4.52 4.00

2 3.67 157/ 207 3.67 3.89 4.09 4.22 3.67

				Fre	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
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	8	2	5	3.24	1420/1504	3.24	4.46	4.27	4.26	3.24
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	4	3	3	2.67	1472/1503	2.67	4.15	4.20	4.18	2.67
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	5	4	2	2	2.29	1282/1290	2.29	3.92	4.28	4.27	2.29
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	5	6	3	1	1	2.19	1447/1453	2.19	4.11	4.21	4.20	2.19
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	8	4	2	0	1	1.80	1419/1421	1.80	3.87	4.00	3.90	1.80
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	3	6	2	1	2.47	1349/1365	2.47	3.92	4.08	4.00	2.47
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	5	3	3	2.76	1425/1485	2.76	4.00	4.16	4.15	2.76
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	329/1504	4.95	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.95
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1411/1483	2.18	4.00	4.06	4.02	2.18
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1425	3.62	4.52	4.41	4.40	3.62
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1426	3.81	4.74	4.69	4.71	3.81
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1418	3.10	4.23	4.25	4.22	3.10
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1416	3.11	4.29	4.26	4.24	3.11
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1199	2.78	4.22	3.97	3.95	2.78
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	9	2	6	1	1	2.11	1285/1312	2.11	3.76	4.00	3.98	2.11
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	5	5	1	1	2.16	1268/1303	2.16	3.93	4.24	4.23	2.16
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	11	3	4	0	1		1278/1299	1.79	3.97	4.25	4.21	1.79
	Were special techniques successful	2	13	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	746/ 758	2.33	3.01	4.01	3.89	2.33

Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 70 **** 5.00 4.35 4.30

0

0

0

Frequency Distribution

15

15

15

15

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 309

. A)

Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 14

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 6

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	3		1052/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	3		1109/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	866/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1337/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	850/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1201/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1131/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	213/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	0	1		1200/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	2		1096/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	834/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	166/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced	_				•	•	-	- 00			5 00	4 50	4 5 6	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Title Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 309 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 310

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG Instructor:

PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14 Ouestionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Ouestions 1 2 3 4 5 Mean NR NA Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 4 4.50 549/1504 4.44 4.46 4.27 4.27 4.50 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 4.00 1052/1503 4.09 4.15 4.20 4.22 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 3.67 1109/1290 3.66 3.92 4.28 4.31 3.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω Ω 2 4.17 878/1453 4.06 4.11 4.21 4.23 4.17 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 4.20 596/1421 3.97 3.87 4.00 4.01 4.20 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 4.25 581/1365 3.86 3.92 4.08 4.08 4.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained Ω 3 4.17 866/1485 3.76 4.00 4.16 4.17 4.17 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 2 4.17 1337/1504 3.90 4.46 4.69 4.65 4.17 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 4.50 338/1483 4.09 4.00 4.06 4.08 4.33 Lecture 5 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1425 4.37 4.52 4.41 4.43 4.83 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.83 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5.00 ****/1418 3.89 4.23 4.25 4.26 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 3.83 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0 1 5.00 ****/1199 4.22 4.22 3.97 4.02 4.60 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 2.80 1200/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 2 3.60 1096/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 3 4.20 834/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 4. Were special techniques successful 1 5.00 ****/ 758 **** 3.01 4.01 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 1 1 3.50 190/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 3.50 196/ 244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.50 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 2 5.00 1/ 227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 5.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 1 1 5.00 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 * * * * 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 3.50 166/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.50 4 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5 0 0 0 5.00 ****/ 76 **** 5.00 4.61 4.84 5 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5.00 ****/ 70 * * * * 5.00 4.35 4.24 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5 Ω 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 5.00 4.34 3.98 **** **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5 0 5.00 ****/ 76 *** 5.00 4.44 4.51 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 0 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 5 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 0 5.00 ****/ * * * * 5.00 4.43 4.52 *** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5 0 0 0 5.00 ****/ 56 5.00 4.23 4.13 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 5 1 5.00 ****/ 44 *** 5.00 4.65 4.77 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5 0 0 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.00 4.29 4.14 **** 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5.00 4.44 4.47 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.53 4.74 ****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Title

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Instructor:

PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 6

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

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

Page 310

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. C)

Spring 2005

Page 311 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_			Mean
	General														
1. I	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. I	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. I	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1109/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. I	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. I	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	596/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. I	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.25
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	866/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.17
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3			1337/1504		4.46	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. I	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.33
	Lecture	_	•	•	•	•	•		- 00		4 0 0	4 50	4 4 7	4 40	4 00
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1425		4.52	4.41		4.83
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.83
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.67
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1416		4.29	4.26	4.27	3.83
5. I	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.60
	Discussion														
1 т	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	2 90	1200/1312	3.33	2 76	4.00	4.09	2.80
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	2		1096/1303	3.45	3.70	4.24	4.09	3.60
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	3		834/1299	3.43	3.93		4.30	4.20
	Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 758	****	3.97	4.01	4.00	****
T. V	vere special techniques successful	_	-	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ /30		3.01	4.01	4.00	
	Laboratory														
1. 1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	190/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	3.50
	Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	3.50
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	5.00
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225		4.43	4.23	4.29	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	166/ 207		3.89	4.09	4.14	3.50
	Seminar														
1. V	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	***	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. V	Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	***	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. I	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	***	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. I	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. V	Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
1 -	Field Work	_	0	0	0	0	0	-1	F 00	++++/	****	F 00	4 42	4 50	****
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58		5.00	4.43	4.52	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 56 ****/ 44	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	-	0	0	0	-	0	_		,	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 47 ****/ 39	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. I	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 39		5.UU	4.44	4.47	
	Self Paced														
1 г	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 40	****	5 00	4.53	4.74	****
±. ı	sta sett pasea byseem concribate to what you reallied	J	U	J	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 40		3.00	1.55	1.,1	

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Questionnaires: 6

Title

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. C) Instructor:

Enrollment: 14

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 311

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 312 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 10

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			F	rec	quer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	. 1	L	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0)	0	1	2	7	4.60	416/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0)	0	4	1	5	4.10	990/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0)	2	1	1	6	4.10	894/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0)	1	0	5	4	4.20	844/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0)	0	3	1	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0)	3	2	2	1	3.13	1280/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0)	2	2	2	4	3.80	1146/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0)	0	0	10	0	4.00	1411/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0)	0	3	5	2	3.90	989/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	3.78
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0)	0	1	4	5	4.40	900/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0)	0	1	2	7	4.60	1050/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0)	0	3	5	2	3.90	1098/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0)	0	2	2	6	4.40	754/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0)	0	2	2	6	4.40	369/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.45
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0)	0	1	5	3	4.22	612/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	L	0	3	2	3	3.67	1076/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	L	0	1	4	2	3.75	1053/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0)	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0)	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0)	0	1	0	2	4.33	119/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0			0	1	1	1	4.00	179/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0)	0	0	2	1	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0)	0	1	0	2	4.33	79/ 207		3.89	4.09	4.14	4.33
Frequ	ency	, Di	stri	ibut	cior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	.

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				2	1						

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 313 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 10

Title

Instructor:

84-150

Grad.

1

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	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														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	416/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	990/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	894/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	844/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	1	1		1056/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1280/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1146/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1411/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1170/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	3		1128/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	271/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	612/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1076/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1053/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	***	3.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	143/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	119/ 244	3.69	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	179/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	79/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	4.33
Freç	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Guadita Bassad Guadas				Da		_			m				M =	_
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке.	ason 	ຣ ∶			Туј	 pe			Majors 	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4														

Electives

Other

0

9

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

D 0

F 0

0

Ρ

I

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A)

Ρ

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 314 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera.	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504	4.44	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.20
_		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	910/1503	4.09	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.20
		uestions reflect	_	_	1	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1219/1290	3.66	3.92	4.28	4.31	3.20
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the exped	cted goals	1	2	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1191/1453	4.06	4.11	4.21	4.23	3.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ute to wha	at you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	745/1421	3.97	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute to v	what you learned	2	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	782/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y explaine	ed	1	0	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1378/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.10
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1484/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	3.40
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	850/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.00
		Lecture	=															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well pre	epared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1002/1425	4.37	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.32
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested in t	the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1050/1426	4.64	4.74	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and expl	lained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1098/1418	3.89	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.95
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what you	u learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	921/1416	4.14	4.29	4.26	4.27	4.10
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance your	r understanding	2	1	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	973/1199	4.22	4.22	3.97	4.02	3.38
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	-	at you learned	3	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1093/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	3.25
		nts actively end		-	3	0	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1195/1303	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage i	fair and o	open discussion	4	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1220/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	2.86
		Laborat	orv															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understar	-	the material	8	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	224/ 233	3.31	3.69	4.09	4.12	2.33
				ound information	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	214/ 244		3.73	4.09	4.20	3.33
		materials avail			8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	208/ 227	4.24	4.36	4.40	4.46	3.33
4. Did th	e lab ins	structor provide	e assistar	nce	8	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.29	***
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clear	rly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	182/ 207	3.69	3.89	4.09	4.14	3.33
		Semina	c															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear		10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	***	5.00	4.17	4.25	***
		Field V	vork															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry		ld activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	***	5.00	4.44	4.47	***
				Frequ	ionai	, Diat	t will be	u+ i o	n									
				rrequ	iency	DIS	CLID	ucio.	11									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G							Re	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	- 	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83	5-83 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 2					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 1														
Grad.	4-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D						ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh

Other

9

? 0

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Instructor:

PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 315 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	2				~ ~										
Ceneral Cene				Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
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 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Do 2. 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.09 4.00 4.01 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1. Do 2. 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.90 4.06 4.11 4.21 4.23 3.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Do 2. 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.90 4.06 4.00 4.06 4.08 4.00 1. Deture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor experiments actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor experiments actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase inderstanding encouraged to participate 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 2. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 3. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 4. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 4. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 4. D	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Do 2. 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.09 4.00 4.01 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1. Do 2. 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.90 4.06 4.11 4.21 4.23 3.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Do 2. 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.90 4.06 4.00 4.06 4.08 4.00 1. Deture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor experiments actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor experiments actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase inderstanding encouraged to participate 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 1. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 2. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 3. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 4. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 4. Did the lab increase or grading made clear 4. D	1														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignements contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O.		1	Λ	0	1	1	2	_	4 20	062/1504	1 11	1 16	1 27	4 27	4 20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 0 4 2 2 3.20 1219/1290 3.66 3.92 4.28 4.31 3.20 4.01 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 4.00 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 4.00 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 4.00 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 4.00 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		_	-	-	_	_	<i>3</i>	5							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1. 0 0 2 1 3 2 2 3.10 1378/1485 3.76 4.00 4.16 4.07 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.30 971/1425 4.37 4.52 4.40 4.06 4.08 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8. 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 971/1425 4.37 4.52 4.41 4.43 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8. 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 4.00 1013/1418 3.89 4.23 4.25 4.26 3.95 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_		-	_			2		,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 0 0 2 3 3 2 4.00 745/1421 3.97 3.87 4.00 4.01 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 782/1365 3.86 3.92 4.08 4.08 4.00 7.00 7.00 7.00 7.00 7.00 7.00 7.00					-			3							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 782/1365 3.86 3.92 4.08 4.08 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 2 1 3 2 2 3.10 1378/1485 3.76 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.90 4.46 4.69 4.55 3.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1483 4.09 4.00 4.06 4.08 4.00			3	0	0			2		. ,					
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0 0 2 3 4 1 3.40 1484/1504 3.90 4.46 4.69 4.65 3.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/1483 4.09 4.00 4.06 4.08 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 971/1425 4.37 4.52 4.41 4.43 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 967/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 967/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1199 4.22 4.22 3.97 4.02 3.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.02 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.12 3.33 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work		2	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	782/1365	3.86	3.92	4.08		4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8		1	0	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1378/1485	3.76	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.10
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1484/1504	3.90	4.46	4.69	4.65	3.40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 971/1425 4.37 4.52 4.41 4.43 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 967/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.67 967/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1199 4.22 4.22 3.97 4.02 3.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 1 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 2.00 3.00 4.00 1019/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 3.00 3.01 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1483	4.09	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 971/1425 4.37 4.52 4.41 4.43 4.32 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 967/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.67 967/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1199 4.22 4.22 3.97 4.02 3.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 1 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 ****															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 967/1426 4.64 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 1013/1418 3.89 4.23 4.25 4.26 3.95 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1199 4.22 4.22 3.97 4.02 3.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 ****		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1 22	071/1405	1 27	4 E2	1 11	1 12	1 22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 8. O 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 8. Discussion 8. O 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 8. Discussion 8. O 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 8. Discussion 8. Discussion 9. O 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1199 4.22 4.22 3.97 4.02 3.38 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 1 3 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 8. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 9. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.66 3.33 9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 8. Seminar 9. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 ****															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1029/1416 4.14 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1199 4.22 4.22 3.97 4.02 3.38 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 1 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3.40 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work			-	-	-	-				,					
Discussion Discus					-					,					
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 2 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/25 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work		-			-		_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 1 1 3 3.25 1093/1312 3.33 3.76 4.00 4.09 3.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work	5. Dia addiovibadi ecomiques emanee your anderstanding		Ū	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 1100	1.22	1.22	3.57	1.02	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 1 3 1 1 2 3.00 1195/1303 3.45 3.93 4.24 4.27 3.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 2 2 1 1 2.86 1220/1299 3.69 3.97 4.25 4.30 2.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work	Discussion														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 ****		3	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1093/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	3.25
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work							1						4.24		
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1220/1299	3.69	3.97	4.25	4.30	2.86
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 224/233 3.31 3.69 4.09 4.12 2.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 214/244 3.69 3.73 4.09 4.20 3.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work	<u>-</u>	ρ	Ο	1	Ο	2	Ω	Ω	2 33	224/ 233	2 21	3 69	4 09	4 12	2 33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 208/227 4.24 4.36 4.40 4.46 3.33 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work				_	-		-	1		,					
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 225 4.33 4.43 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/ 207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work				-				_							
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 0 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 182/ 207 3.69 3.89 4.09 4.14 3.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work	-			-	_		-			/					
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work		8		0			0	1		, -					3.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work	<u> </u>														
Field Work															
	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
	Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 10 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.44 4.47 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.44	4.47	****
	_		- D' -			_									
Frequency Distribution	Freq	uency	, Dist	cribi	ıtıor	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	

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	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			

? 0

FUND DIGITAL DESIGN LA

Title BOURNER, DAVID

Instructor:

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 316 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	eanei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General	_		_	_		_	_							
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504		4.46	4.27	4.27	5.00
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.20	4.22	5.00
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1453	5.00	4.11		4.23	5.00
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.87	4.00	4.01	5.00
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1365	5.00	3.92	4.08	4.08	5.00
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1485	5.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	5.00
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1504		4.46	4.69	4.65	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.00	4.06	4.08	4.50
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.43	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.71	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1418	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.26	5.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1416		4.29	4.26	4.27	5.00
••	pra the rectares contribute to what you rearned	Ū	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1/1110	3.00	1.25	1.20	1.2,	3.00
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.09	5.00
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.93	4.24	4.27	5.00
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.30	5.00
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	3.69	4.09	4.12	5.00
	Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		83/ 244		3.73	4.09	4.20	4.50
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 227	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.46	5.00
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 227	5.00	4.43	4.23	4.40	5.00
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 223	5.00	3.89	4.23	4.14	5.00
٥.	were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	U	U	O	U	O	O	2	3.00	1/ 20/	3.00	3.05	4.00	4.14	3.00
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.84	5.00
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.24	5.00
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	3.98	5.00
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.51	5.00
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.25	5.00
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.52	5.00
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.13	5.00
	Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 44		5.00	4.65	4.77	5.00
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.14	4.00
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39		5.00	4.44	4.47	
٠.	Dia conferences help you carry out freta activities	Τ.	U	J	J	J	J	_	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	7.77	4.1 /	5.00
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.74	5.00
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.36	5.00
3.	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.63	5.00

Title FUND DIGITAL DESIGN LA

Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 316 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	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	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 317

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: YAN, LI Enrollment: 25

Ouestionnaires: 18

Title

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Ouestions 1 2 3 4 5 Mean NR NA Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 13 4.72 295/1504 4.72 4.46 4.27 4.27 4.72 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4.20 4.22 14 4.78 200/1503 4.78 4.15 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4.83 180/1290 4.83 3.92 4.28 4.31 4.83 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω 11 4.85 135/1453 4.85 4.11 4.21 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 4.25 548/1421 4.25 3.87 4.00 4.01 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 10 4.69 169/1365 4.69 3.92 4.08 4.08 4.69 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 11 4.50 455/1485 4.50 4.00 4.16 4.17 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 16 4.89 691/1504 4.89 4.46 4.69 4.65 4.89 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 9 4.60 258/1483 4.60 4.00 4.06 4.08 4.60 Lecture 1 0 0 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 1 3 13 4.71 510/1425 4.71 4.52 4.41 4.43 4.71 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 2 15 4.88 549/1426 4.88 4.74 4.69 4.71 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 4.59 475/1418 4.59 4.23 4.25 4.26 4.59 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 3 14 4.82 232/1416 4.82 4.29 4.26 4.27 4.82 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 4.00 636/1199 4.00 4.22 3.97 4.02 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 4 4.67 255/1312 4.67 3.76 4.00 4.09 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 5 4.67 450/1303 4.67 3.93 4.24 4.27 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 4 4.50 570/1299 4.50 3.97 4.25 4.30 4. Were special techniques successful 12 2 3.75 ****/ 758 **** 3.01 4.01 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 3.69 4.09 4.12 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 5.00 ****/ 244 **** 3.73 4.09 4.20 **** **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 5.00 ****/ 227 * * * * 4.36 0 4.40 4.46 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 17 0 0 5.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.43 4.23 4.29 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17 0 1 5.00 ****/ 207 **** 3.89 4.09 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 5.00 ****/ 76 5.00 4.61 4.84 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 5.00 4.35 4.24 4.34 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 5.00 ****/ 67 **** 5.00 3.98 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 5.00 ****/ 76 * * * * 5.00 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 5.00 ****/ * * * * 5.00 4.43 4.52 *** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 0 5.00 ****/ 56 5.00 4.23 4.13 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 17 0 5.00 ****/ 44 5.00 **** 4.65 4.77 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 17 0 0 5.00 ****/ 47 * * * * 4.00 4.29 4.14 **** 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 5.00 4.44 4.47 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.53 4.74 ****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	***	5.00	4.49	4.36	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	***	5.00	4.60	4.63	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	***

Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR

Instructor: YAN, LI
Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 18

PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 317 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

WAVES & TRANSMISSION

Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 5

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 318 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	412/1290	4.60	3.92	4.28	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.11	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1201/1365	3.40	3.92	4.08	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1123/1483	3.75	4.00	4.06	4.08	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.52	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1141/1418	3.80	4.23	4.25	4.26	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1145/1416	3.80	4.29	4.26	4.27	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.22	3.97	4.02	4.40
Discussion	0	0	0	-1	0	0	_	2 22	1000/1210	2 22	2 56	4 00	4 00	2 22
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	Ţ	0	2	0		1070/1312	3.33	3.76	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.93	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	U	U	Τ	Τ	Τ	4.00	922/1299	4.00	3.97	4.25	4.30	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	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	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 416L 0101

CAPSTONE COMP ENGR LAB

Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 21

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 319 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	eque	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		_	_		_	_									
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from thi		0	0	1	0	2	8			914/150		4.46	4.27	4.33	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expecte		1	0	1	2	3	10	4		1231/150		4.15	4.20	4.18	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expect	_	0	4	1	4	6	3	3		1223/129		3.92	4.28	4.32	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expecte		0	1	1	3	2	9	5		1214/145		4.11	4.21	4.22	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what		0	1	2	4	8	5	1		1321/142		3.87	4.00	4.02	2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to wha	t you learned	0	5	2	1	6	7			1280/136		3.92	4.08	4.09	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	1	1	3	6	10	0		1348/148		4.00	4.16	4.14	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/150		4.46	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching	effectiveness	2	0	1	0	10	6	2	3.42	1267/148	3.42	4.00	4.06	4.11	3.42
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepa	red	2	0	1	0	0	9	9	4.32	991/142	5 4.32	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the		2	0	1	0	0	2		4.68			4.74	4.69	4.72	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explai	-	2	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	,		4.23	4.25	4.25	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you l		2	0	2	1	6	8	2		1275/141			4.26	4.26	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your u		4	1	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	762/119			3.97		3.88
J. Dia addiovidual ecciniiques cinianee your a	inacibeanaing	-	_	-	Ü	3	-	O	3.00	702/110	3.00	1.22	3.57	1.05	3.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what	you learned	13	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	966/131	3.63	3.76	4.00	4.07	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to	participate	14	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1012/130	3.86	3.93	4.24	4.34	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and ope	n discussion	14	0	0	0	3	2	2		1017/129		3.97	4.25	4.38	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful		14	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 75	3 ****	3.01	4.01	4.17	****
- 1															
Laboratory		1.0	0	^	^	^	^	0	F 00	**** / OO	2 ****	2 60	4 00	2 70	***
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the		19	0	0	0	0	0	∠ 1		****/ 23		3.69	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate backgroun		19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 24		3.73	4.09	3.56 4.16	****
3. Were necessary materials available for la		20	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 22° ****/ 22°		4.36	4.40	3.81	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		19 19	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 20		4.43	4.23		****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly	specified	19	U	U	Т	Т	U	U	2.50	***/ 20	,	3.89	4.09	3.69	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what y	ou learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 5	3 ****	5.00	4.43	4.83	***
3. Was the instructor available for consulta		20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	1 ****	5.00	4.65	4.33	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field	activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3) ****	5.00	4.44	4.19	****
	Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu	ıtio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum GPA Ex	nected Grades				Re.	ason	g			T	me			Majors	l.

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	1
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	6	D	0			_		_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-	_	•	

? 2

Course-Section: CMPE 419 0101 Title

COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL

PHATAK, DHANANJ Instructor:

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 320 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	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	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	910/1503	4.20	4.15	4.20	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	412/1290	4.60	3.92	4.28	4.32	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.11	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	943/1421	3.80	3.87	4.00	4.02	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.92	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1173/1504	4.40	4.46	4.69	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.00	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.23	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.29	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	429/1199	4.33	4.22	3.97	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.76	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.93	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.50	3.01	4.01	4.17	2.50

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	4	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0					_	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	^						

Course-Section: CMPE 451 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County CAPSTONE II Spring 2005 BOURNER, DAVID Instructor:

Title

Enrollment:

2

Page 321 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

		~	~		
Questionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.15	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	3.92	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.11	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.87	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	3.92	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.46	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.00	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.29	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.22	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.93	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	3.01	4.01	4.17	5.00

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

Course-Section: CMPE 641 0101
Title TOPICS IN VLSI
Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN

6

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 322 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	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
Canaval														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.15	4.20	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1/1303	5.00	3.92	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4		158/1453	4.80	4.11	4.21	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3		1/1421	5.00	3.87	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.67	3.92	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1		4.75	200/1485		4.00	4.16		4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504		4.46	4.69		4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483		4.00	4.06		5.00
Lecture		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.52			4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.23	4.25	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416		4.29	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	4.22	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.76	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	3.93	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.97	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 758	****	3.01	4.01	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	3.69	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	3.73	4.09	4.09	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 225	5.00	4.43	4.23	4.69	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	3.89	4.09	4.40	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.48	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.15	***
Diald Maule														
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 58	****	5 00	1 12	/ 2 1	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	-	0	0	0			****/ 56					
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0 0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44			4.23		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	***		4.05		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	***		4.44		****
J. Did conferences help you early out litera activities	-1	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 39		5.00	1.11	1.55	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	***	5.00	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: CMPE 641 0101 Title TOPICS IN VLSI Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 322 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CMPE 650 0101
Title DIGITAL SYSTEMS
Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 323 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR 													
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	4	11	4.41				4.27	4.44	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	633/1503		4.15	4.20	4.28	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	800/1290		3.92	4.28	4.36	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	631/1453		4.11	4.21	4.34	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1 1	0	2 2	5 5	7 6	4.13	651/1421 742/1365	4.13 4.07	3.87 3.92	4.00	4.27 4.35	4.13 4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5 4	9	4.07	693/1485		4.00	4.08	4.35	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	8		1087/1504	4.50	4.46	4.16	4.79	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31			4.00	4.06	4.79	4.31
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-1	U	U	U	2	5	O	4.51	300/1403	4.51	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	1050/1425	4.24	4.52	4.41	4.51	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	808/1426	4.76	4.74	4.69	4.80	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	867/1418	4.24	4.23	4.25	4.36	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	837/1416	4.29	4.29	4.26	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	766/1199	3.87	4.22	3.97	4.04	3.87
Diamondo.														
Discussion	_	0	1	0	2	1	4	2 02	050/1210	2 02	2 76	4 00	4 21	2 02
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5 5	0	1 0	0 1	3 1	4	4 7	3.83	858/1312	3.83	3.76 3.93	4.00	4.31	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	-	_	_	-		4.33	737/1303	4.33	3.93	4.24	4.58	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0 5	0 2	0 0	1 0	5 2	6 3	3.57	667/1299 563/ 758		3.97		4.56 4.24	4.42 3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	2	U	U	2	3	3.5/	563/ /58	3.5/	3.01	4.01	4.24	3.5/
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	129/ 233	4.17	3.69	4.09	4.56	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	140/ 244	4.17	3.73	4.09	4.09	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	179/ 227	4.00	4.36	4.40	4.66	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	125/ 225	4.33	4.43	4.23	4.69	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	166/ 207	3.50	3.89	4.09	4.40	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 56	***	5.00	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	***	5.00	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 ****/	35	****	5.00	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 ****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: CMPE 650 0101
Title DIGITAL SYSTEMS
Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA

19

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 323 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CMPE 691C 0101
Title SPEC TOP IN CMPE
Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 324 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NIR	NA	Fr	Frequencies 1 2 3		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	
~ucbtions													·	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.46	4.27	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.15	4.20	4.28	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.43			3.92	4.28		4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4		4.33	,		4.11	4.21		4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	1			745/1421			4.00		4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40			3.92	4.08		4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0 2	4 2			563/1485		4.00	4.16		4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 1	0	0	0	2	∠ 3	3		1353/1504 1061/1483		4.46	4.69		4.14 3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	2	3	Т	3.03	1001/1403	3.03	4.00	4.06	4.20	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	700/1425	4.57	4.52	4.41	4.51	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3			1073/1426		4.74	4.69	4.80	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3			818/1418		4.23	4.25		4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1416	4.29	4.29	4.26	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.22	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	572/1312		3.76	4.00	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57			3.93	4.24	4.58	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43			3.97		4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	2	0	0	1	U	2.00	752/ 758	2.00	3.01	4.01	4.24	2.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	3.73	4.09	4.09	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.43	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.89	4.09	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	5.00	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	Ο	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	***	5.00	4.49	4.46	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36		5.00	4.60	4.75	****
ooro par contacto with the instructor helpful	J	J	0	J	J	_	J	1.00	, 30		3.00	1.00	1.,5	
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	า									
	D -					m-				M =				

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected (Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	0			

Course-Section: CMPE 691M 0101 Title

SPEC TOP IN COMPE

Darwish, Ali Instructor:

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 325 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions			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	2	6	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.15	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	507/1290	4.50	3.92	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	310/1453	4.63	4.11	4.21	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.60	3.87	4.00	4.27	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	159/1365	4.71	3.92	4.08	4.35	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	2	2	4	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.00	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.46	4.69	4.79	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	1	2	2	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.00	4.06	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			0	0	0	3	5	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.52	4.41	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.23	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.29	4.26	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	149/1199	4.71	4.22	3.97	4.04	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	4.67	3.76	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.93	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	3.97	4.25	4.56	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	3.01	4.01	4.24	3.33

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