Course-Section: ENEE 302 0101 Title

PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN

Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 673 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	952/1576	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	528/1576	4.66	4.10	4.27	4.28	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	583/1342	4.63	4.07	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	3	4		3.89	1179/1520		4.04	4.25	4.25	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	748/1465		4.07			4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	d 1	6	0	0	1	5		4.22	716/1434		4.34		4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4			259/1547		4.35	4.19		4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7		1128/1574		4.47			4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 0	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	532/1554	4.50	4.06	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	293/1488	4.88	4.45	4.47	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1101/1493	4.81	4.85	4.73	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	607/1486	4.42	4.12	4.32	4.32	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	888/1489	4.67	4.03	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	623/1277	4.45	4.44	4.03	4.11	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1279	4.00	4.13	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.42	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	198/ 234	3.79	3.79	4.23	4.24	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	115/ 240		4.30	4.35	4.32	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	221/ 229	3.86	3.86	4.51	4.48	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	6			155/ 232		4.40	4.29	4.16	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	5			155/ 379		4.41		4.17	4.25
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.33	4.01	4.01	4.12	3.00
ni da wada														
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.10	3.95	4.03	4.23	3.00
Self Paced	1.0	1	0	0	5	0	0	2 00	313/ 382	2 22	2 52	4 00	4 04	2 00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	U	0	5	0	U	3.00	313/ 382	3.33	3.52	4.08	4.24	3.00
Fre	quency	/ Dis	strik	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	requency Distribution des Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					 or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4		Λŧ	-darr	cu I	or Ma	JOL	D	U	G1 adual	_	J	Ma J	<i></i>	U
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 4		Ge	enera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 3 D 0									3	-			3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0		E	lecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
Р 0									respons				_	
I 0		Ot	ther				1	4						
? 0														

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102

PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN

Title Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 674 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	279/1576	4.66	4.10	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.63	4.07	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	945/1520	4.03	4.04	4.25	4.25	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1166/1465	3.91	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	594/1434	4.28	4.34	4.14	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	141/1547	4.80	4.35	4.19	4.21	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5			1227/1574	4.42	4.47	4.64	4.61	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.50	4.06	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4 00	202/1400	4 00	4 4 5	4 47	1 17	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1 0	8	4.88	293/1488	4.88 4.81	4.45 4.85	4.47 4.73	4.47	4.88 5.00
 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 	1	0	0	0	1	3		4.29	1/1493 936/1486	4.81		4.73	4.70 4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1489	4.42	4.12	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	-	4.75	159/1277	4.67	4.03		4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	2	0	4.75	159/12//	4.45	4.44	4.03	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.13	4.17	4.20	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.36	4.35	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.50
- 1														
Laboratory	-	0	-	0	-	•	_	2 06	100/024	2 50	2 50	4 00	4 0 4	2 06
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	188/ 234	3.79	3.79	4.23	4.24	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	171/ 240	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	2	2	2		203/ 229	3.86	3.86	4.51	4.48	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1 0	0	0	0 1	2 2	4 5	4.67	75/ 232	4.40	4.40	4.29	4.16	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	U	U	U	U	1	2	5	4.50	77/ 379	4.38	4.41	4.20	4.17	4.50
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	203/ 375	3.33	4.01	4.01	4.12	3.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	51/ 52	2.00	1.50	4.48	4.37	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	48/ 48	2.00	2.00	4.40	3.92	2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	***	4.50	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	223/ 326	3.10	3.95	4.03	4.23	3.20
3. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	2	_	U	U	4	_	U	3.20	223/ 320	3.10	3.95	4.03	4.23	3.20
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 40	4.50	4.63	4.60	4.83	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.89	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.00	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.67	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	203/ 382	3.33	3.52	4.08	4.24	3.67

Course-Section: ENEE 302 0102

Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN

Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 674 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		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	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101

Title DET EST THEORY I

Instructor: ADALI, TULAY (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 675 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	219/1576	4.83	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2		1023/1576	4.17	4.10	4.27	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.07	4.32	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0		4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.07	4.12	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0		4.50			4.34	4.14	4.35	4.50
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.50		4.50	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4			1262/1574		4.47	4.64	4.75	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	3.42	4.06	4.10	4.18	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	870/1488	4.25	4.45	4.47	4.52	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.67	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	678/1486	3.50	4.12	4.32	4.37	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	<i>5</i>	4.67	500/1489	3.58	4.12	4.32	4.38	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.03	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Т	3	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/12//	5.00	4.44	4.03	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.13	4.17	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.55	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1		4.50	221/ 878	4.50		4.05	4.11	4.50
	_	-	-	-	-	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.79	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.86	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.40	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.41	4.20	4.37	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.50	4.69	4.77	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0		4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.00	4.64	4.70	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.61	4.70	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	171/ 375	4.33	4.01	4.01	4.10	4.33
mini di mania														
Field Work	_	0	^	^	^	0	1	F 00	**** / FO		1 50	4 40	4 40	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	1.50	4.48	4.40	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	2.00	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.88	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	27/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.65	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	145/ 326	4.50	3.95	4.03	4.10	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 40	4.50	4.63	4.60	4.50	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.67	4.78	4.75	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	2	0		4.00	185/ 382			4.08	4.13	4.00
J. Here there enough procedus for all the students	2	U	U	U	2	U	۷	Ŧ.UU	103/ 302	Ŧ.UU	5.54	Ŧ.00	4.13	Ŧ.00

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

DET EST THEORY I
ADALI, TULAY (Instr. A)

Instructor: ADALI, TULAY (Inst:
Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 675 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101 Title

DET EST THEORY I

Instructor:

Baltimore County (Instr. B) Spring 2009

7 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 676

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	219/1576	4.83	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1023/1576	4.17	4.10	4.27	4.32	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	583/1342		4.07	4.32	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.50	511/1520		4.04	4.25	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	571/1465		4.07	4.12	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	398/1434		4.34	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.50	- , -		4.35	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0 1	0 1	4 0	0		1262/1574 1524/1554		4.47 4.06	4.64 4.10	4.75 4.18	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	1	1	U	U	2.50	1524/1554	3.42	4.06	4.10	4.18	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1233/1488	4.25	4.45	4.47	4.52	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	1		1210/1493		4.85	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	0	0		1471/1486		4.12	4.32	4.37	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1466/1489	3.58	4.03	4.32	4.38	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.13	4.17	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.55	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.53	4.05	4.11	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.79	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.30	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	3.86	4.51	4.51	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.40	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.41	4.20	4.37	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.50	4.69	4.77	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.00	4.64	4.70	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1		48/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.61	4.70	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	171/ 375	4.33	4.01	4.01	4.10	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.50	4.48	4.40	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	2.00	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.88	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.65	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	145/ 326	4.50	3.95	4.03	4.10	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 40	4.50	4.63	4.60	4.50	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35		4.00	4.67	4.33	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.67	4.78	4.75	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	185/ 382	4.00	3.52	4.08	4.13	4.00

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101 University of Maryland
Title DET EST THEORY I Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 7

Spring 2009

Page 676 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	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	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County INFORM THEORY

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I Spring 2009 Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

Page 677 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2 2	0	0	2	0 2	2	1		1482/1576 1570/1576	3.40	4.33 4.10	4.30 4.27	4.43 4.32	3.40 2.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	2 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 1 0	0 1 0 0 1	1 1 0 0	3 1 1 0 2 3	0 2 2 3 2 2	0 1 1 0 0	2.80 3.60 4.25 3.00 3.40	1279/1342 1493/1520 1208/1465 682/1434 1459/1547 1562/1574	3.00 3.40	4.07 4.34 4.35 4.47	4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64	4.75	4.25 3.00 3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture	4	0	0	2	0	1			1514/1554		4.06	4.10	4.18	
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 	2 2 2 2 3	0 0 0 0 3	0 0 0 1 0	0 0 2 0 0	1 0 1 0	3 2 1 3 0	3 1 1	4.60 3.20 3.60	1233/1488 1125/1493 1392/1486 1298/1489 ****/1277	4.00 4.60 3.20 3.60 ***	4.85 4.12 4.03	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.38	4.00 4.60 3.20 3.60 ****
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2 2 3	0 0 0	4 4 2	0 0 1	1 1 1	0 0 0	0	1.40	1277/1279 1269/1270 1268/1269	1.40 1.40 1.75	4.13 4.32 4.36	4.35	4.34 4.53 4.55	1.40
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	***	4.41	4.20	4.37	***
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.01	4.01	4.10	****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	3.95	4.03	4.10	***
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.52	4.08	4.13	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			quire nera:		or Ma	jors.		0	Graduate Under-gr		1	Majo Non-	r major	3
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Ele Oth	ectiv ner	ves				0	#### - I response				_	h

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENEE 631 0101

2

SEMICOND DEVICES

CHOA, FOW-SEN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Page 678 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies				ructor		Dept			Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.10	4.27	4.32	4.50
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	1				4.07	4.32	4.38	4.50
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1			850/1465	4.00	4.07	4.12	4.25	4.00
	_	-		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.34	4.14	4.35	5.00
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	1			527/1547	4.50	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.47	4.64	4.75	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		924/1554			4.10	4.18	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.45	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1493			4.73	4.80	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	,	4.50		4.32	4.37	4.50
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.03	4.32	4.38	4.50
					1	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	692/1277			4.03		
		ovisual techniques enhance your understandi Discussion																
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.13	4.17	4.34	3.50
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269				4.55	
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors fo		he students	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.52	4.08	4.13	3.00
				Frequ	onar	. Dia	+ m i b		_									
				riequ	lency	DIS	CLID	ucio	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	s	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENEE 635 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO OPTICAL COMM Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 679 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI Spring 2009
Enrollment: 6

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Questionnaires: 6

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 20	1010/1576	4 20	4 22	4 20	1 12	4 20
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	1	0	0	0	0	4 2	1	4.20	1019/1576 476/1576	4.20 4.60		4.30 4.27	4.43 4.32	4.20 4.60
	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520			4.32	4.36	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.04	4.12	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		1	0	0	1	2	1					4.14		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.00	878/1434		4.34 4.35		4.35 4.24	4.00 4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5		411/1547	4.60		4.19	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled		2	0			-		5.00	1/1574			4.64		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	U	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.45	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.03	4.32	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.44	4.03	4.08	4.75
_, ,														
Discussion	_		•	•			_		000/1000	4 00	4 4 4 4		4 0 4	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	802/1279			4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.36		4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.53	4.05	4.11	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	***	4.30	4.35	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	4.50	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 72	****	4.00	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	4.50	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	1		180/ 375			4.01	4.10	4.00
or hole offorfia for grading made offorf	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	1.00	100, 3.3	1.00	1.01	1.01	1110	1.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.50	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	2.00	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	***	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.95	4.03	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.63	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****		4.67		****
jour concess with the institution incipital	4	-	0	0	0	1	_	4 00	/ 33	also also also also	2.50	1.07	4 12	at at at at

4 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 382 **** 3.52 4.08 4.13 ****

Course-Section: ENEE 635 0101

Title INTRO OPTICAL COMM

Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 679 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	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	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010

Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI

Instructor:

Enrollment:

TAYLOR, RICHARD

25 Questionnaires: 20

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 680 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-		Mean	
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	568/1576	4.55	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	698/1576	4.45	4.10	4.27	4.32	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.07	4.32	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	744/1520	4.35	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	6	3	6		1292/1465	3.40	4.07	4.12	4.25	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.34	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	624/1547	4.45	4.35	4.19	4.24	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1288/1574	4.30	4.47	4.64	4.75	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	827/1554	4.14	4.06	4.10	4.18	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.45	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	251/1489	4.85	4.03	4.32	4.38	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	10	6	4.11	645/1277	4.11	4.44	4.03	4.08	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	617/1279	4.32	4.13	4.17	4.34	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	5	4	8	3.95	974/1270	3.95	4.32	4.35	4.53	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	814/1269	4.26	4.36	4.35	4.55	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	311/ 878		4.53		4.11	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	2 67	****/ 234	****	3.79	1 22	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 240	****	4.30	4.23 4.35	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 229	****	3.86	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 232	****	4.40	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 379	***	4.41	4.20	4.37	****
Garden en														
Seminar	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	****/ 85	****	г оо	4 70	4 70	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17 17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 5.00	****/ 85 ****/ 79	****	5.00 4.50	4.72	$4.79 \\ 4.77$	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 72	****	4.00	4.69 4.64	4.77	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 80	****	4.50	4.64	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	2	5 6		141/ 375	4.75		4.01	4.10	4.75
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	12	U	U	U	U	2	O	1.75	141/ 3/3	4.75	1.01	1.01	4.10	4.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	1.50	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	2.00	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	***	3.95	4.03	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.63	4.60	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	3.52	4.08	4.13	****

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010

Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI

Instructor: TAYLOR, RICHARD

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 680 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 670 8010
Title SYST ENGR PROJ
Instructor: HOCH, PETER

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 681 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7				
Questionnaires:	6	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General															
2. Did the in 3. Did the ex 4. Did other	in new insights, skills fro structor make clear the ex am questions reflect the e evaluations reflect the ex n assignments contribute t	pected goals xpected goals pected goals	0 0 0 0	0 0 4 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 3 0 0	6 3 2 5 2	0 0 0 0 3	3.50 4.00	1148/1576 1392/1576 972/1342 1041/1520 323/1434	3.50 4.00 4.00	4.33 4.10 4.07 4.04 4.34	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.14	4.43 4.32 4.38 4.36 4.35	4.00 3.50 4.00 4.00 4.60
7. Was the gr 8. How many t	ading system clearly expla imes was class cancelled you grade the overall teac	ined	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 2	3 0 3	2 5 0	4.17	924/1547 1/1574 1267/1554	4.17 5.00	4.35 4.47 4.06	4.19 4.64 4.10	4.24 4.75 4.18	4.17 5.00 3.60
2. Did the in 3. Was lectur 4. Did the le	Lecture nstructor's lectures well structor seem interested i e material presented and e ctures contribute to what isual techniques enhance y	n the subject xplained clearly you learned	2 0 1 2	0 0 0 0 4	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 2 1 0	3 0 1 2 0	1 6 2 1 0	5.00 4.00 4.00	1111/1488 1/1493 1101/1486 1118/1489 ****/1277	5.00 4.00 4.00	4.45 4.85 4.12 4.03 4.44	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.52 4.80 4.37 4.38 4.08	4.25 5.00 4.00 4.00 ****
 Were all s Did the in 	Discussion discussions contribute to tudents actively encourage structor encourage fair an al techniques successful	d to participate	1 1 1	0 0 0 4	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	2 2 2 0	2 3 2 0	4.20 4.60 4.20 3.00	712/1279 559/1270 852/1269 ****/ 878	4.20	4.13 4.32 4.36 4.53	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.34 4.53 4.55 4.11	4.20 4.60 4.20 ***
5. Were crite	Seminar ria for grading made clear		4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.01	4.01	4.10	5.00
5. Did confer	Field Work ences help you carry out f	ield activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	3.95	4.03	4.10	5.00
5. Were there	Self Paced enough proctors for all t	he students	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	3.52	4.08	4.13	5.00
		Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earne	d Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	!			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 28-55 0 56-83 0	1.00-1.99 0	A 2 B 4 C 0			quire nera:		or Ma	jors		0	Graduat Under-g		6	Majo Non-	or major	0
84-150 0 Grad. 6	*****	D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ectiv ner	res				0 5	#### - : respons				_	rh

Course-Section: ENEE 671 8010

SER ORIENTED ARCHITECT

Title Instructor: HOCH, PETER

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 682 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions								ncies				cructor			_		Level		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	_																
1. Did you	ı gain nev	w insights,skil	ls from	this course	0	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1520/1	576	3.14	4.33	4.30	4.43	3.14
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1523/1	576	3.00	4.10	4.27	4.32	3.00
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	4	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1329/1	342	2.67	4.07	4.32	4.38	2.67
		ations reflect			0	0	1	3	1	1			1503/1			4.04	4.25	4.36	2.71
		adings contribu		_	0	0	1	1	1	2			1282/1		3.43		4.12		3.43
				what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	0			1397/1		2.86	4.34	4.14	4.35	
		system clearly		ed	0	0	0	0	0	5		4.29	805/1		4.29		4.19	4.24	
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		574	5.00	4.47		4.75	
9. How wou	ıld you gı	rade the overal	.l teachi	ng effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1227/1	.554	3.67	4.06	4.10	4.18	3.67
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lectures	well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	970/1	488	4.43	4.45	4.47	4.52	4.43
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1	493	4.71	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.71
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presented	l and exp	lained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1101/1	486	4.00	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute to	what yo	u learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	1338/1	489	3.43	4.03	4.32	4.38	3.43
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	623/1	277	4.14	4.44	4.03	4.08	4.14
		Discuss	ui on																
1 Did ala	aa diaan	Discuss ssions contribu		at way learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.29	641/1	270	4.29	4.13	4.17	4.34	1 20
		ts actively end		-	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		279	5.00	4.13	4.17	4.53	
				open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	332/1		4.86			4.55	
		chniques succes		open discussion	0	4	0	0	1	0	-	4.33	,		4.33				
i. Were be	occiai cc	Similyaes sacces	blui		U	-	O	O	_	O		1.33	522/	070	1.55	1.55	1.05	1.11	1.33
		Seminar																	
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading made	clear		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	375	5.00	4.01	4.01	4.10	5.00
		Field W	Jork																
5. Did con	nferences	help you carry	out fie	ld activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	326	****	3.95	4.03	4.10	****
		Self F																	
5 Were th	nere enoue	sell P ah proctors for		students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/	382	****	3 52	4 08	4 13	****
3. ,,610 61.	1010 011043	511 P1000012 101	. 411 0110	Doudelles	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	5.00	,	502		3.32	1.00	1113	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	oe .			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Grad	luate	3	5	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				4	Unde	r-gi	rad	2	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-		_		,			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0		Εle	ectiv	ves				1			Means t				n
				P 0		Oth	202					0	resp	OIIS	es to b	e sign	ıııcan	. L	
				? 0		OCI	ıer.					U							
				: 0															

Course-Section: ENEE 683 0101

Title LASERS
Instructor: YAN, LI
Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 683 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 1138/1576 4.00 4.10 4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 770/1342 4.33 4.07 4 4 1.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4 4.75 4.
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 861/1576 4.33 4.33 4 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 1138/1576 4.00 4.10 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 770/1342 4.33 4.07 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1041/1520 4.00 4.04 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 850/1465 4.00 4.07 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 911/1574 4.67 4.47 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 1.00 4 1	4.32 4.38 4.35 4.36 4.25 4.35 4.36 4.35 4.4 4.35 4.9 4.24 4.75 4.
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 770/1342 4.33 4.07 4 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1041/1520 4.00 4.04 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 850/1465 4.00 4.07 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.35 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 911/1574 4.67 4.47 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 1 4 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	22 4.38 4. 25 4.36 4. 22 4.25 4. 4 4.35 4. 9 4.24 4. 64 4.75 4.
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1041/1520 4.00 4.04 4 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 850/1465 4.00 4.07 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 911/1574 4.67 4.47 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1554 5.00 4.06 4 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.	4.36 4. 2 4.25 4. 4 4.35 4. 9 4.24 4. 64 4.75 4.
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 850/1465 4.00 4.07 4 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 911/1574 4.67 4.47 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1554 5.00 4.06 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.36 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.36 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.36 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.36 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.36 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.36 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.36 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.30 4 1.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.00 1041/1547	.2 4.25 4. .4 4.35 4. .9 4.24 4. .4 4.75 4.
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 911/1574 4.67 4.47 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1554 5.00 4.06 4 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 4 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 1.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4 4.35 4. 9 4.24 4. 4 4.75 4.
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.35 4 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 911/1574 4.67 4.47 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1554 5.00 4.06 4 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/379 4.00 4.41 4	.9 4.24 4. 54 4.75 4.
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 911/1574 4.67 4.47 4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1554 5.00 4.06 4 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	4 4.75 4.
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1554 5.00 4.06 4 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/379 4.00 4.41 4	
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	0 4.18 5.
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.45 4 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/379 4.00 4.41 4	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 468/1486 4.67 4.12 4 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	7 4.52 4.
A. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.03 4 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	3 4.80 5.
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	32 4.37 4.
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	32 4.38 5.
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 335/1279 4.67 4.13 4 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/379 4.00 4.41 4	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 636/1270 4.50 4.32 4 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/379 4.00 4.41 4	7 4.34 4.
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 644/1269 4.50 4.36 4 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	5 4.55 4.
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 229/ 379 4.00 4.41 4	
Seminar	0 4.37 4.
5. Were criteria for grading made clear $1 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 287/ 375 3.00 4.01 4$	1 4.10 3.
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	8 4.40 1.
Self Paced	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students $1 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 313/ 382 3.00 3.52 4$	8 4.13 3.
Frequency Distribution	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type	Majors
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 0 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 2 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2	ijor
	n-major
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0	11 major
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are	ot enough
P 0 responses to be signif	
I 0 Other 1	
? 1	

Course-Section: ENEE 718D 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN SIGNAL PROCE Baltimore County

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 5 5.00

RUTLEDGE, JANET

Instructor: Enrollment: 8 Ouestionnaires: 8

Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1576 5.00 4.33 4.30 4.43 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 173/1576 4.88 4.10 4.27 4.32 4.88 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 406/1342 4.67 4.07 4.32 4.38 4.67 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.04 4.25 4.36 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 148/1465 4.86 4.07 4.12 4.25 4.86 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 6 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.34 4.14 4.35 4.50

1 0 2 4 4.29 805/1547 4.29 4.35 4.19 4.24 4.29

1/1554 5.00 4.06 4.10 4.18 5.00

0 0 0 0 5 3 4.38 1227/1574 4.38 4.47 4.64 4.75 4.38

Page 684 JUL 2, 2009

T.o	at 1	120

7. Was the grading system clearly explained

8. How many times was class cancelled

ere the instructor's lectures well prepared	Τ	U	0	U	U	U	./	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.45	4.47	4.52	5.00
id the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00
as lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.12	4.32	4.37	4.86
id the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.86	4.03	4.32	4.38	4.86
id audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	273/1277	4.57	4.44	4.03	4.08	4.57
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clearly id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 7 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 6	id the instructor seem interested in the subject $1 0 0 0 0 7 5.00$ as lecture material presented and explained clearly $1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86$ id the lectures contribute to what you learned $1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86$	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 $1/1493$ as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 $221/1486$ id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 $251/1489$	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1493 5.00 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 221/1486 4.86 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 251/1489 4.86	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 221/1486 4.86 4.12 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 251/1489 4.86 4.03	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4.73 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 221/1486 4.86 4.12 4.32 id the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 251/1489 4.86 4.03 4.32	id the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1493 5.00 4.85 4.73 4.80 as lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 221/1486 4.86 4.12 4.32 4.37

0

0 1

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.13	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.36	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.53	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Laboratory

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0 4.00 ****/ 379	****	4.41	4.20	4.37	****

Seminar

5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 375 **** 4.01 4.01 4.10 ****

Self Paced

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 4 0 0 0 4 0 0 3.00 313/382 3.00 3.52 4.08 4.13 3.00

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

Course-Section: ENEE 728C 0101

ADV CODING TOPICS & AP

Title Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2 Spring 2009

Page 685 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

								_	ncies	5	_		tructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Question 	.s 		NR	NA		2	3 	4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/157	6 4.50	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.50
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1392/157	6 3.50	4.10	4.27	4.32	3.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1341/134	2 2.00	4.07	4.32	4.38	2.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/152	0 4.00	4.04	4.25	4.36	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/146	5.00	4.07	4.12	4.25	5.00
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/143		4.34	4.14	4.35	5.00
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/157	4 4.00	4.47	4.64	4.75	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/155	4 4.00	4.06	4.10	4.18	4.00
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1484/148	8 2.00	4.45	4.47	4.52	2.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1210/149	3 4.50	4.85	4.73	4.80	4.50
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1421/148	6 3.00	4.12	4.32	4.37	3.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1489/148	9 1.00	4.03	4.32	4.38	1.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/127	9 4.50	4.13	4.17	4.34	4.50
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/127	0 5.00	4.32	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/126	9 5.00	4.36	4.35	4.55	5.00
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	229/ 37	9 4.00	4.41	4.20	4.37	4.00
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 4	0 5.00	4.63	4.60	4.50	5.00
		acts with the i			1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	34/ 3	5 2.00	4.00	4.67	4.33	2.00
		ck/tutoring by			1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 2	8 4.00	4.67	4.78	4.75	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
O	a al	G GD3		Formant of Consider				Da		_							Ma =	
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	3 			Т	ype 			Majors 	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Gradua	te	2	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-	grad	0	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0		Means			_	ſh
				P 0									respon	ses to 1	be sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENEE 788I 0101

Title TOPICS IN ELECTROPHYSI

Questions

Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 686 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

		General	1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	1	0	2	1	3 75	1345/1576	3.75	4.33	4.30	4.43	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	1	2	1		1138/1576		4.10	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						1	0	0	0	1	2		406/1342		4.07	4.32	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	1	2			1041/1520		4.04	4.25		4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00				4.12	4.25	4.00
	_	_		_	1	-	-	-	0	_	-		,		4.07			
		_		what you learned		0	0	0	•	2	2	4.50			4.34	4.14		4.50
		g system clearly		ned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,		4.35	4.19	4.24	4.67
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	1	3		758/1574		4.47	4.64		4.75
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectivenes	s 4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1554	****	4.06	4.10	4.18	****
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well r	repared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.45	4.47	4.52	4.75
		tor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	,		4.12		4.37	
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	3		4.25		4.25	4.03			4.25
				our understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1			309/1277					
5. Did auc	alovisual	. techniques em	nance yo	our understanding	1	۷	U	U	U	1	1	4.50	309/12//	4.50	4.44	4.03	4.08	4.50
		Discus																
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.13	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.32	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.36	4.35	4.55	5.00
		chniques succes		-	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.53	4.05	4.11	****
	-	-																
5 Were re	egui remer	Laborat	-	arly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	77/ 379	4 50	4 41	4 20	4 37	4 50
J. Were re	equiremen	ics for lab repo	JI US CIE	arry specified	1	U	U	U	U	2	۷	4.50	11/ 319	4.50	4.41	4.20	4.37	4.50
		Semina																
5. Were ci	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	4.01	4.01	4.10	3.00
		Field V	Work															
5. Did cor	nferences	s help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	180/ 326	3.50	3.95	4.03	4.10	3.50
		Self I	Daced															
5. Were th	here enou	igh proctors for		e students	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	***	3.52	4.08	4.13	****
				_		- ·	,											
				Fre	quency	DIS	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grade	5			Re	ason	S			Type			Majors		3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 S	0	Graduate		5	Majo	 or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			=			J						5 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-gr	ad	0	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		00	c. a	_				5	onaci -gi	uu	•	14011		J
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		רים	ecti	7700				0	#### - M	leana +	here -	ro not	anous	rh
P 0 I 1						БŢ	CCLI	ves				U					_	ìīī
						~ .	1					0	response	s to r	e sign	ııııcar	l L	
						Οt	her					0						
	? 0																	

Course-Section:	ENEE 800 0203	University of Maryland	Page 687
Title	GRADUATE RESEARCH	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	CHEN, YUNG JUI	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: CHEN, YUNG JUI
Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1 Spring 2009

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.33	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.10	4.27	4.32	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.07	4.12	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.47	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.06	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.80	5.00	
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.41	4.20	4.37	4.00	

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