Course-Section: ENEE 206 0102

Title BASIC CIRCUIT THEORY

Instructor: YAN, LI
Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 619 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	eane:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 54	General		0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4 50	E40/1401	4 50	1 00	4 20	4 40	4 -
1 3	n new insights, skills from this cours		0	0	0	1	4	3	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.50 3.80
	tructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	2	2	4	_		1160/1481 1009/1249	3.83	4.26		4.29	3.8
	m questions reflect the expected goal				0	1	0		4			3.83	4.37	4.27	4.36	
	valuations reflect the expected goals		0	3 5	-	1	1	5 1	_	4.11	896/1424	4.11	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.1 4.1
_	d readings contribute to what you lea		0	5 4	0	0	4	1	4	4.14	603/1396	4.14	4.07	3.98	3.94	
	assignments contribute to what you l	rearned	0	0	0	2	3	3		3.88	905/1342	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.8
_	ding system clearly explained		0 1	0	0	0	0	1	4 10		1154/1459	3.75	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.7
_	mes was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.91	702/1480 973/1450	4.91	4.64 4.10	4.68	4.68	4.9
. How would y	ou grade the overall teaching effecti	iveness	2	U	U	U	2	,	Τ	3.90	9/3/1450	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.9
	Lecture															
. Were the in	structor's lectures well prepared		1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	466/1409	4.73	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.7
. Did the ins	tructor seem interested in the subject	ct	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	880/1407	4.73	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.
. Was lecture	material presented and explained cle	early	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1096/1399	3.91	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.9
. Did the lec	tures contribute to what you learned	-	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	921/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.
	sual techniques enhance your understa		2	5	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.0
	Discussion															
Did alage d	iscussions contribute to what you lea	arned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	570/1262	4.25	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.3
	udents actively encouraged to partici		8	0	0	3	0	0	1		1209/1259	2.75	4.40	4.29	4.34	2.
	tructor encourage fair and open discu	_	8	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	901/1256		4.34	4.30	4.28	4.0
	l techniques successful	ubb1011	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	690/ 788	3.25	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.2
. Here presid	I commidate processini		Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	_	_	3.23	0,00, 7,00	3.23	1.05	1.00	3.30	3.2
	Laboratory		_					_	_							
	increase understanding of the materi		1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 246	4.36	4.26	4.20	4.51	4.3
	ovided with adequate background infor		1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	133/ 249	4.18	4.08	4.11	4.32	4.1
	ary materials available for lab activ	vities	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	173/ 242	4.18	4.45	4.40	4.63	4.1
	instructor provide assistance		1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	153/ 240	4.18	4.37	4.20	4.58	4.1
. Were requir	ements for lab reports clearly specif	fied	1	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	103/ 217	4.27	4.42	4.04	4.28	4.2
	Self Paced															
. Did self-pa	ced system contribute to what you lea	arned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	**
. Did study q	uestions make clear the expected goal	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	* *
. Were your c	ontacts with the instructor helpful		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	***	4.42	4.65	4.66	**
-	dback/tutoring by proctors helpful		11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	***	4.50	4.83	4.43	**:
	enough proctors for all the students		11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	**:
		Freque	encv	Dist	trib	utio	n									
		_	-1													
redits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected	Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	}
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A	3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	(
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0 B	5														
56-83 4	2.00-2.99 0 C	2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	12	Non-	-major	(
84-150 6	3.00-3.49 7 D	0													-	
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 4 F	1		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh

Other

11

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN Baltimore County

YAN, LI

Instructor: YAN, I
Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 620 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies	5	Е	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions		NA						Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	меап
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1069/1481	3.67	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1130/1481	3.44	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1036/1249	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1138/1424	4.17	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.29	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	920/1342	3.93	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1343/1459	3.11	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.50	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1013/1409	3.81	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1257/1407	3.79	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1294/1399	3.29	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1261/1400	4.19	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	1.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	1.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1256	1.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	100/ 246	3.70	4.26	4.20	4.20	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	174/ 249	4.15	4.08	4.11	4.23	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	144/ 242	4.20	4.45	4.40	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	53/ 240	4.65	4.37	4.20	3.96	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 217	4.15	4.42	4.04	4.11	4.80
Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		 Re	anir	 ed f	or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	 Majo		0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102 University of Maryland Title

PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN Baltimore County

Instructor: YAN, LI Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 3

Spring 2006

Page 621 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	-	ncies				tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1407/1481	3.67	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1420/1481	3.44	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.14	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.17	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.29	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	3.93	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.11	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	836/1450	3.50	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2 22	1325/1409	3.81	4.46	4.42	4.43	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		1382/1409		4.77	4.42	4.43	3.33
•	-	0	1	0	0	1	1		1382/1407		4.77			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	1	U	0	0	U T	2.		1/1400		4.35	4.26 4.27	4.27	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	U	1	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/1400	4.19	4.35	4.2/	4.28	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1260/1262	1.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1257/1259	1.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1254/1256	1.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	Λ	1	0	3.00	240/ 246	3.70	4.26	4.20	4.20	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	76/ 249	4.15	4.08	4.11	4.23	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	184/ 242		4.45	4.11	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	104/ 242		4.45	4.40	3.96	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	165/ 217	4.05	4.37	4.20		3.50
5. were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	Τ	U	U	U	Τ	Τ	U	3.50	105/ 21/	4.15	4.42	4.04	4.11	3.50
Frequ	encv	Diet	rib	ıt i or	า									

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

Course-Section: ENEE 610 0101 University of Mary:
Title DIGITAL SIG PROC Baltimore County
Instructor: CHETTI, SAMIR Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

11

University of Maryland Page 622
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	883/1481	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.2
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.0
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	988/1249	3.89	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.8
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.8
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	816/1396	3.89	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.8
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.2
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.8
3. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1422/1480	3.89	4.64	4.68	4.74	3.8
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1189/1450	3.60	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.6
Lecture														
l. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1245/1409	3.78	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.7
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1153/1407	4.44	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1196/1399	3.67	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1095/1400	3.89	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1035/1179	3.11	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	907/1262	3.71	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.
. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	703/ 788	3.17	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.
Laboratory														
. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	* *
. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	* *
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	* *
. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	* *
. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	**
Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3

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

Course-Section: ENEE 611 0101

ADAPTIVE SIGNAL PROCES

Title Instructor: ADALI, TULAY

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 623 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	947/1481	4.17	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3		4.17	,	4.17	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.30		4.16	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3		4.40	704/1400	4.40	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	510/1179	4.17	3.94	3.96		4.17
Discussion		_			_	_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	437/1262	4.40	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	***	4.42	4.04	3.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92		***
Field Work	-	0	•	0	0	•	-	F 00		also also also also	2 00	4 20	4 01	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	***	4.04	4.00	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	3.68		4.27	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENEE 611 0101

Title ADAPTIVE SIGNAL PROCES

Instructor:

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Baltimore County ADALI, TULAY Spring 2006

Page 623 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101 Title DET EST THEORY I

Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 624 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
---------------	------------	---------------	--

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	884/1481	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	788/1249	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.12	4.07	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1		4.00	,		4.19	4.16	4.01	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	880/1480		4.64	4.68	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2			1285/1450		4.10			3.33
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	O	_	U	2	U	3.33	1203/1130	3.33	1.10	1.00	3.70	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4 00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407		4.77	4.69	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	_		1002/1399		4.30	4.26	4.16	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0			1120/1400		4.35	4.27	4.17	3.80
4. Did the fectures contribute to what you rearned	U	U	U	2	U	U	3	3.00	1120/1400	3.00	4.33	4.27	4.1/	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	2 00	1146/1262	3.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.00
	1 1	0	0	0	2	1	1			3.75	4.10	4.05	4.30	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		-			_	_	_		1043/1259					
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	1		1042/1256		4.34	4.30	4.33	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	***
T all and beautiful.														
Laboratory		0	•	•	•	0	-	F 00		de de de de	4 06	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****
• • •														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 24		4.50	4.82	5.00	****
1 Sudding Process for all one seading	-	ŭ	Ü	Ū	Ū	•	_	2.00	, 21		1.55		2.00	

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101
Title DET EST THEORY I
Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 624 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101

Title INFORM THEORY

Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 625 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer					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	3	9	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	173/1424	4.82	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	86/1342	4.90	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	91/1459	4.92	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1450	4.89	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1399	4.83	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	134/1179	4.75	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1259	4.91	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1256	5.00		4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	142/ 788	4.64	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101
Title INFORM THEORY
Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 625 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 631 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County SEMICOND DEVICES Spring 2006

Title Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI 9

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 626

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies			3						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	4	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	632/1481	4.43	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	257/1396	4.57	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	872/1459	4.14	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Ω	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	384/1179	4.33	3.94	3.96		4.33
5. Did didiovibual econniques chiance your understanding	Ü	-	Ü	J	-	_	5	1.33	301/11/3	1.33	3.71	3.30	3.01	1.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1012/1256	3.83	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	2.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	Ο	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****
3 3 3 444 4 44														

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENEE 636 0101 WIRELESS COMM CHOA, FOW-SEN 3

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

F	age	627	
JUN	13,	2006	
Job	IRB	R3029	

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	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	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	4.33	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00
Lecture														

	Lecture													
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00 1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33 1221/1407	4.33	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.33
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00 1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.00
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00 1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.00
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00 590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	4.03	4.00	3.97	2.50

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

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010

Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES

Instructor: Hoch, Peter

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 628 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 268/1481 4.78 4.26 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 7 2 4.22 854/1481 4.22 4.26 3. Did the exam guestions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 2 5 4.22 765/1249 4.22 4.37	4.29 4.28 4.78 4.23 4.11 4.22 4.27 4.24 4.22 4.21 4.16 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 268/1481 4.78 4.26 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 7 2 4.22 854/1481 4.22 4.26	4.23 4.11 4.22 4.27 4.24 4.22 4.21 4.16 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.67 4.07 4.18 4.22
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 268/1481 4.78 4.26 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 7 2 4.22 854/1481 4.22 4.26	4.23 4.11 4.22 4.27 4.24 4.22 4.21 4.16 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.67 4.07 4.18 4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 7 2 4.22 854/1481 4.22 4.26	4.23 4.11 4.22 4.27 4.24 4.22 4.21 4.16 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.67 4.07 4.18 4.22
·	4.27 4.24 4.22 4.21 4.16 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.67 4.07 4.18 4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals $0.0011.0011.0011.0001.0001.0001.0001.0$	4.21 4.16 4.00 3.98 4.00 3.67 4.07 4.18 4.22
5. 214 315 cham Aucociono Icirco che checcoa gourd 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 1.22 703/1249 1.22 1.37	3.98 4.00 3.67 4.07 4.18 4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 1 3 3 4.00 959/1424 4.00 4.27	4.07 4.18 4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 3 2 3.67 985/1396 3.67 4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 5 3 4.22 565/1342 4.22 4.12	4.16 4.01 4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 647/1459 4.38 4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1480 5.00 4.64	4.68 4.74 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4.09 3.96 4.22
Lecture	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 417/1409 4.75 4.46	4.42 4.36 4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1407 5.00 4.77	4.69 4.73 5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 3 3 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 4.30	4.26 4.16 4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 969/1400 4.13 4.35	4.27 4.17 4.13
<u>-</u>	3.96 3.81 4.57
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 2 5 1 3.56 976/1262 3.56 4.18	4.05 4.07 3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 1 3 4 1 3.56 1086/1259 3.56 4.40	4.29 4.30 3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 1 5 2 3.89 992/1256 3.89 4.34	
4. Were special techniques successful 0 7 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 **** / 788 **** 4.03	4.00 3.97 ****
Laboratory	
<u>.</u>	4.11 3.93 3.00
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 4 2 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 42/ 68 4.67 4.66	4.49 4.23 4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 4 1 0 0 2 2 0 3.50 65/ 69 3.50 4.26	4.53 4.46 3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4 3 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 63 **** 4.24	4.44 4.44 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 4 2 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 59/ 69 3.33 4.19	4.35 4.16 3.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 3.98	3.92 3.71 ****
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned $$ 5 $$ 0 $$ 1 $$ 2 $$ 4.25 $$ 37/ $$ 59 $$ 4.25 $$ 3.92	4.30 4.01 4.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria $$ 5 $$ 0 $$ 2 $$ 0 $$ 3.50 $$ 40/ 51 3.50 $$ 4.04	4.00 3.81 3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4 3 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 5.00	4.60 4.65 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 4 2 0 1 1 0 1 3.33 $37/$ 41 3.33 3.68	4.26 4.27 3.33
Self Paced	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned $$ 5 $$ 2 $$ 0 $$ 2 $$ 2.50 $$ 55 $$ 2.50 $$ 3.90	4.55 4.38 2.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 1 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 25/ 31 4.33 4.28	4.75 4.95 4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 5 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 39/ 51 4.67 4.42	4.65 4.54 4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 34 **** 4.50	4.83 5.00 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 5 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 24 **** 4.50	4.82 5.00 ****

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010

Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES

Instructor: Hoch, Peter

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 628 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	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	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010

Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI

Instructor: Taylor, Richard

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 13

14

Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 629 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	Sect
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	280/1481		4.26	4.29	4.28	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	286/1481	4.69	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1		****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	909/1396	3.77	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	858/1342		4.12	4.07	4.18	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	924/1459	4.08	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	164/1450	4.75	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	117/1400	4.92	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	381/1262	4.46	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	422/1259	4.69	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	345/1256	4.77	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	4	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	196/ 249	3.50	4.08	4.11	3.93	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	3	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.27	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	3	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	58/ 59	2.25	3.92	4.30	4.01	2.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.58	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****
J. HOLE Your contacts with the instructor helpful	± 0	_	J	J	J	_	U	1.00	/ 31		1.74	1.03	1.54	

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010

Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI

Instructor: Taylor, Richard

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 629 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to 1	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010

MODELING, SIM AND ANAL

Title Instructor: Marks, Maury

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 630 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		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	2	0	4	1	3 57	1334/1481	3.57	4.26	4.29	4.28	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	4	1		1355/1481	3.43	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	2		1132/1249		4.37	4.27	4.24	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00			4.27	4.21	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	626/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1394/1450	2.83	4.10	4.09	3.96	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1228/1409	3.86	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	3		1296/1407		4.77	4.69	4.73	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	1	0		1367/1399		4.30	4.26	4.16	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	2.86	1339/1400	2.86	4.35	4.27	4.17	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	4	1	0	1	2.67	1114/1179	2.67	3.94	3.96	3.81	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	2.57	1216/1262	2.57	4.18	4.05	4.07	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00			4.40	4.29		4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	3	2		1004/1256			4.30	4.33	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 69		4.26	4.53		****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 09		4.20	4.55	4.40	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT Instructor: MARTIN, PAUL (Instr. A) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	7	0	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42
3. Did th	he exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480		4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1406/1450	3.42	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42
		Lecture	e.															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1031/1409	4.41	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.41
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	1	4	6		1257/1407		4.77	4.69	4.73	4.43
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	1	3	2	5	1	3.17	1308/1399	3.93	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.92
		es contribute to			1	0	2	3	1	3	2	3.00	1312/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.79
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	753/1179	3.90	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.90
		Discus	sion															
1 Did c	lass disc			what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3 50	995/1262	3 50	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.50
				d to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2			1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75
				d open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2	5		1088/1256		4.34	4.30		3.58
		echniques succes		a open arboassion	0	3	0	2	1	4	_	3.67			4.03			3.67
				<b>T</b>		- <b>-</b>												
				Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	ıtıoı	1									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	рe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e 1		Majo	r •	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С 0		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		El	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.0	_					
				? 0														

Page 631

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010 University of Maryland Title JUN 13, 2006

SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 632

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

		Ouestions	_		NTD	NA	Fre	_	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	
		Questions	> 		INIX.	NA				- <del>1</del>		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	L															
1. Did yo	ou gain new	v insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	2	3	7	0	3.42	1359/1481	3.42	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00
5. Did as	ssigned rea	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33
6. Did wr	ritten assi	ignments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50
		vas class cance			0	0	0	0	0	-		5.00	1/1480		4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you gr	ade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.42	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42
1 77	and the second	Lecture	_		_	0	0	0	0	_	-	4 50	670 /1400	4 41	1 10	4 40	4 26	4 41
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	5	7		670/1409			4.42	4.36	4.41
		or seem intere		xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5 6	7	4.25	1046/1407 828/1399		4.77 4.30	4.69 4.26	4.73 4.16	4.43 3.92
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	2	4		4.25	,		4.35	4.20	4.17	3.79
				our understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4		4.00	590/1179		3.94			3.79
J. Diu au	adiovisuai	teciniiques em	lance y	our understanding	U	_	U		2	4	4	4.00	390/11/9	3.90	3.74	3.90	3.01	3.90
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discus	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.50
				d to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75
3. Did th	ne instruct	or encourage f	air an	d open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1088/1256	3.58	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.58
4. Were s	special tec	chniques succes	ssful	_	0	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.67
				<b></b>		- <b>5</b> 2			_									
				Frequ	lency	Dist	ribu	ıtıor	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	3	0	Graduat	e 1	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

10

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010 University of Maryland Title JUN 13, 2006

Page 633

Job IRBR3029

SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT Baltimore County Spring 2006 Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 14 Quest

stionnaires: 12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	2
-----------------	-----------------------------------------	---

I

?

0

0

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	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	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	7	0		1359/1481		4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	861/1249		4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	3	6	3	0		1361/1424		4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00
				what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2		1167/1396		4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33
				o what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1		1234/1342		4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17
		g system clearl			0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	12		1/1480		4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1124/1450		4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42
1 17	-b	Lectur	_		^	0	0	0	1	_	_	4 40	878/1409	4.41	1 10	4 40	1 26	1 11
		uctor's lecture ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	5 4	7	4.42	1107/1409		4.46 4.77	4.42	4.36 4.73	4.41
					0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.50	973/1399		4.77	4.69	4.16	3.92
		eriai presente es contribute t		explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	5 4		1017/1400		4.30	4.25	4.15	3.92
				our understanding	0	2	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	692/1179					3.79
5. DIG at	udiovisua.	r techniques en	nance y	our understanding	U	2	U	Т	2	4	3	3.90	692/11/9	3.90	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.90
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	995/1262	3.50	4.18	4.05	4.07	3.50
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.75
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1088/1256	3.58	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.58
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		0	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.67
				Frequ	ency.	Dist	trib	ution	า									
				-	-													
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	aior	 s	0	Graduat	 e 1	.0	Majo	r •	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2						- J	-	-	- 0.0.0.0.	_	-	5		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_							_	_						

Other

10

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010 University of Maryland Title JUN 13, 2006

SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. D) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 634

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies				ructor	Course	_			
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	3	5	3	0	1	2.25	1479/1481	2.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.25
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	3	7			1359/1481	3.42	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.42
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	9			861/1249		4.37	4.27	4.24	4.08
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.33
6. Did wi	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1234/1342	3.17	4.12	4.07	4.18	3.17
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.50
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	2	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1249/1450	3.42	4.10	4.09	3.96	3.42
		T	_															
1 Wome +	the insta	Lectur actor's lecture		nwanawad	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	891/1409	1 11	1 16	1 12	4.36	1 11
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	4	-		1184/1407		4.77	4.42		4.41
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	1		5			883/1399		4.77	4.09	4.16	
		es contribute t			3	0	0	1		3			1095/1400				4.17	
				our understanding	2	1	0	1		3			705/1179					
5. DIG at	uu10v1Sua.	r techniques en	lance y	our understanding	۷		U	1	4	3	3	3.09	705/11/9	3.90	3.94	3.90	3.01	3.90
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4			995/1262			4.05	4.07	3.50
		_	_	d to participate	0	0	2	1	1	2			1043/1259		4.40	4.29		3.75
				d open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	2			1088/1256		4.34			3.58
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		0	3	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.67
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	rib	utio	n									
	_ ,							_					_					
Credits I	Earned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e 1	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				_							_	_						

Other

10

0

0

I ? Course-Section: ENEE 683 0101 University of Maryland Page 635
Title LASERS Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: CARTER, GARY Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 6

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluatio	m Ollagt	1 Onn 2 1 ro

Questionnaires: 5

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.60
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.40
3. Did tl	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.80
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.25
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.20
		_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.50
7. Was tl	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1459	4.80	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.80
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480		4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How we	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.67
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	5.00
4. Did tl	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.60
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.80
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did tl	he instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1025/1256	3.80	4.34	4.30	4.33	3.80
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3								_	_					_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		_						_						_
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	nifican	ıt	

Other

4

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENEE 684 0101
Title INTRO PHOTONICS
Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN

6

Enrollment:

Grad.

2

3.50-4.00

2

F

Ρ

I

0

0

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2006

Page 636 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		 General																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.00	
	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1179/1481	3.80	4.26	4.23	4.11	3.80	
		uestions reflect the	_	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1136/1249	3.40	4.37	4.27	4.24	3.40	
	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1160/1424	3.80	4.27	4.21	4.16	3.80	
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.20	
	5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	3	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the	. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1125/1459	3.80	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.80	
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.80	
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1184/1407	4.40	4.77	4.69	4.73	4.40	
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1217/1399	3.60	4.30	4.26	4.16	3.60	
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	4.00	
		l techniques enhance		0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	4.00	
		Discussion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.20	
2. Were a	.ll stude	nts actively encourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	680/1259	4.40	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.40	
	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	4	1	4.20	809/1256	4.20	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.20	
		echniques successful	-	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.03	4.00	3.97	3.50	
2. Were y	ou provid	Laboratory ded with adequate bac	kground information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	***	
		Seminar																
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention			4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****		
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned				4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 63		4.24	4.44	4.44	****	
	_	ons contribute to wha	_	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 69		4.19	4.35	4.16	****	
		for grading made clea		4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68		3.98	3.92	3.71	****	
		Field Work																
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute to	what vou learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.01	****	
		y understand your eva		4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.81	****	
_		ctor available for co		4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36		5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
		could you discuss yo		4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.27	****	
		s help you carry out		4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50		4.58	****	
		Self Paced																
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the instruc	tor helpful	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 1				 ed f	 or Ma	iore		2	 Graduat			 2 Major			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		r.e.	1ull	cu I	OI Md	ייייי ני	,	_	Graduat	_	4	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-9	rad	3	Non-	major	1	
84-150	0	3.00-2.33 0	D 0		ری	c. a	-				_	onaci -g	_ uu	5	14011		_	
0-1-130	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0											1			_	

Electives

Other

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

? 0

Course-Section: ENEE 718D 0101

Title

Instructor: RUTLEDGE, JANET

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 637 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			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	1	1	1	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.26	4.29	4.28	4 EO
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.20	4.50 4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.24	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	645/1424		4.27	4.21	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	238/1342	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1459		4.19	4.16	4.01	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450		4.10	4.09	3.96	
Lecture	0	0	0	•	0	-	_	4 00	000/1400	4 00	1 16	4 40	4 26	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0 1	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00 4.67	4.77	4.69 4.26	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0 2	5 3	4.67 4.33	376/1399 791/1400		4.30	4.26	4.16	4.67 4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	840/1179		3.94		4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	Τ	U	1	2	2	3.67	840/11/9	3.67	3.94	3.96	3.81	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.23	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.46	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.16	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.71	****
0.16 70 1														
Self Paced	_	0	_	^	0	0	1	г оо	**** / FF	****	2 00	4 55	4 20	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55 ****/ 31	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0				-	_		,		4.28	4.75	4.95	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51 ****/ 34	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24		4.50 4.50	4.83 4.82	5.00 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 24		4.50	4.02	5.00	
Frem	anas	Dia	-rih	n+ i o	n									

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