

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 688
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	943/1649	3.96	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	556/1648	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	753/1375	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.22	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1067/1595	3.74	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1381/1533	3.05	4.03	4.04	4.05	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1101/1512	3.67	4.22	4.10	4.11	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	894/1623	3.94	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	731/1646	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	619/1621	4.09	4.11	4.06	4.02	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	827/1568	4.56	4.48	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	840/1572	4.85	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	8	11	4.33	854/1564	4.24	4.19	4.28	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	7	12	4.27	952/1559	4.20	4.19	4.29	4.23	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	556/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1384	2.75	3.98	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1382	3.50	4.27	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1368	3.17	4.33	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.08	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	176/ 221	3.74	3.22	4.16	4.07	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	206/ 243	3.43	4.01	4.12	3.89	3.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	5	2	4	4	3.47	200/ 212	3.91	4.35	4.40	4.21	3.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	2	0	3	7	3	3.60	180/ 209	3.82	4.06	4.35	4.12	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	3	8	4	3.82	444/ 555	4.17	4.69	4.29	4.22	3.82
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	83/ 288	3.75	4.02	3.68	3.58	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.60	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	3.42	3.97	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 689
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1391/1649	3.96	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	873/1648	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.18	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	862/1375	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.22	4.22	4.18	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1202/1595	3.74	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.21	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1249/1533	3.05	4.03	4.04	4.05	4.05	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	723/1512	3.67	4.22	4.10	4.11	4.11	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	1029/1623	3.94	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	632/1621	4.09	4.11	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.30
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	803/1568	4.56	4.48	4.43	4.39	4.39	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	4.85	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	918/1564	4.24	4.19	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1079/1559	4.20	4.19	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1049/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.97	3.50
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1254/1384	2.75	3.98	4.08	4.11	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	946/1382	3.50	4.27	4.29	4.37	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1229/1368	3.17	4.33	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.08	3.95	4.00	****	****
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	64/ 221	3.74	3.22	4.16	4.07	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	188/ 243	3.43	4.01	4.12	3.89	3.89	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	65/ 212	3.91	4.35	4.40	4.21	4.21	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	139/ 209	3.82	4.06	4.35	4.12	4.12	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	323/ 555	4.17	4.69	4.29	4.22	4.22	4.40
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	3.75	4.02	3.68	3.58	3.58	4.00
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.60	3.60	4.00
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	100/ 110	3.42	3.97	3.99	4.05	4.05	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	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	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 690
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1295/1649	3.96	4.31	4.28	4.27	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1254/1648	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1208/1375	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.22	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1470/1595	3.74	4.29	4.20	4.21	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	2	2	0	2.43	1516/1533	3.05	4.03	4.04	4.05	2.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1428/1512	3.67	4.22	4.10	4.11	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1337/1623	3.94	4.28	4.16	4.08	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	4.09	4.11	4.06	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	699/1568	4.56	4.48	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	931/1572	4.85	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1064/1564	4.24	4.19	4.28	4.25	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	966/1559	4.20	4.19	4.29	4.23	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	495/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1346/1384	2.75	3.98	4.08	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1316/1382	3.50	4.27	4.29	4.37	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1286/1368	3.17	4.33	4.30	4.39	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.08	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	216/ 221	3.74	3.22	4.16	4.07	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	220/ 243	3.43	4.01	4.12	3.89	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	198/ 212	3.91	4.35	4.40	4.21	3.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	180/ 209	3.82	4.06	4.35	4.12	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	349/ 555	4.17	4.69	4.29	4.22	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	215/ 288	3.75	4.02	3.68	3.58	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	34/ 52	4.00	4.50	4.06	3.59	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	25/ 48	4.00	4.50	4.09	4.21	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	35/ 53	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.32	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	28/ 30	3.50	4.25	4.16	4.44	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	96/ 110	3.42	3.97	3.99	4.05	3.50	

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0103
 Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 690
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 610 0101
 Title DIGITAL SIG PROC
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 691
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	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	0	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.27	4.23	4.34	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1112/1375	3.75	4.41	4.27	4.44	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.29	4.20	4.35	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1270/1623	3.75	4.28	4.16	4.29	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1549/1568	2.67	4.48	4.43	4.52	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1532/1564	2.75	4.19	4.28	4.41	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1550/1559	2.00	4.19	4.29	4.41	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	219/ 221	2.50	3.22	4.16	4.27	2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	4.01	4.12	4.61	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.35	4.40	4.73	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/ 555	4.67	4.69	4.29	4.66	4.67
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 41	4.00	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1057/1649	4.17	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1481/1648	3.50	4.27	4.23	4.34	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	875/1375	4.17	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1566/1595	2.80	4.29	4.20	4.35	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	782/1512	4.17	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.28	4.16	4.29	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1373/1568	3.83	4.48	4.43	4.52	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	4.19	4.28	4.41	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1031/1559	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1160/1352	3.25	4.02	3.98	4.10	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1209/1384	3.20	3.98	4.08	4.30	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	917/ 948	2.50	4.08	3.95	4.03	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	3.22	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.02	3.68	3.87	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.83	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.97	3.99	3.92	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 623 0101
 Title: COMMUN THEORY I
 Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 693
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	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	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.29	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.22	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.28	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1159/1384	3.33	3.98	4.08	4.30	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.08	3.95	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	3	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 630 0101
 Title SOLID STATE ELECTRONIC
 Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 694
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.48	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.33	4.30	4.56	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010
 Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES
 Instructor: HOCH, PETER
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 695
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	4.02	3.98	4.10	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	936/ 948	2.00	4.08	3.95	4.03	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	221/ 221	1.00	3.22	4.16	4.27	1.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.01	4.12	4.61	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.35	4.40	4.73	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.06	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.47	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.58	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.44	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	35/ 53	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.37	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.25	4.16	4.49	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.50	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.67	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	3.97	3.99	3.92	5.00	

Course-Section: ENEE 660 8010
 Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES
 Instructor: HOCH, PETER
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 695
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: MARTIN, PAUL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 696
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.12	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	774/1533	4.06	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	966/1512	3.94	4.22	4.10	4.35	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	864/1621	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	667/1568	4.70	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	790/1572	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	960/1564	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	673/1559	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	624/1352	4.39	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.02	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.25	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 6	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 697
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.12	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	774/1533	4.06	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	966/1512	3.94	4.22	4.10	4.35	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	387/1568	4.70	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	840/1572	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	780/1564	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	763/1559	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	275/1352	4.39	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.02	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.25	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 6	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMPLM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 698
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.12	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	774/1533	4.06	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	966/1512	3.94	4.22	4.10	4.35	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	588/1568	4.70	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1241/1572	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	780/1564	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1079/1559	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	303/1352	4.39	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.02	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.25	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 6	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010
 Title SYSTEM IMLEM INTEGRAT
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 699
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	5	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.12	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	774/1533	4.06	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	966/1512	3.94	4.22	4.10	4.35	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1225/1621	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	636/1568	4.70	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1572	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	854/1564	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1009/1559	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	423/1352	4.39	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.02	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.25	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 9	F 0		Non-major 8
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	16
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ENEE 670 8010
 Title SYST ENGR PROJ
 Instructor: HOCH, PETER
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 700
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1533	****	4.03	4.04	4.28	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	448/1623	4.56	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	600/1564	4.56	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	326/1384	4.67	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.97	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 680 0101
 Title ELECTROMAG THEORY I
 Instructor: YAN, LI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 701
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1277/1559	3.75	4.19	4.29	4.41	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.97	3.99	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 684 0101
 Title INTRO PHOTONICS
 Instructor: YAN, LI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 702
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	414/1648	4.63	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	123/1512	4.88	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.48	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1559	4.88	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.97	3.99	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 712 0101
 Title PATTERN REGOGN
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 703
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	816/1649	4.38	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	782/1595	4.29	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	594/1533	4.29	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	553/1512	4.38	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1198/1623	3.88	4.28	4.16	4.29	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.57	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1302/1621	3.60	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1414/1568	3.71	4.48	4.43	4.52	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1003/1572	4.71	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1316/1564	3.71	4.19	4.28	4.41	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1045/1559	4.14	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	914/1352	3.75	4.02	3.98	4.10	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1181/1384	3.29	3.98	4.08	4.30	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1051/1368	3.86	4.33	4.30	4.56	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	3.97	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 788W 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ELECTROPHYSI
 Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 704
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	230/1649	4.86	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.22	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 221	4.60	3.22	4.16	4.27	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 243	4.80	4.01	4.12	4.61	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	122/ 212	4.40	4.35	4.40	4.73	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/ 209	4.80	4.06	4.35	4.80	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	323/ 555	4.40	4.69	4.29	4.66	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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