```
Course-Section: ENEE 302  0101                 University of Maryland                          Page  673
Title          PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN               Baltimore County                            JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    LABERGE, E.F.                         Spring 2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 16                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC 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	2	3.89	1179/1520	4.03	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	3.91	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	716/1434	4.28	4.34	4.14	4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	259/1547	4.80	4.35	4.19	4.21	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1128/1574	4.42	4.47	4.64	4.61	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	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	9	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	115/ 240	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.32	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	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	1	4.14	155/ 232	4.40	4.40	4.29	4.16	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	155/ 379	4.38	4.41	4.20	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
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														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.33	3.52	4.08	4.24	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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	3	4.38	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														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	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	0	8	5.00	1/1493	4.81	4.85	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	936/1486	4.42	4.12	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.03	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	159/1277	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
Laboratory														
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	4.00	203/ 229	3.86	3.86	4.51	4.48	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	75/ 232	4.40	4.40	4.29	4.16	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	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
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

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENEE 621  0101                University of Maryland                        Page  675
Title       DET EST THEORY I                  Baltimore County                             JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   ADALI, TULAY   (Instr. A)       Spring 2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires:  6                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  0  1  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  4.50  4.07  4.32  4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  1  4  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  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  5  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.34  4.14  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  0  1  1  4  4.50  527/1547  4.50  4.35  4.19  4.24  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  4  2  4.33 1262/1574  4.33  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  5  4.67  500/1489  3.58  4.03  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  4.44  4.03  4.08  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  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  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

                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      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  5.00 ****/  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  2  4.00  185/ 382  4.00  3.52  4.08  4.13  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENEE 621  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page  676
Title         DET EST THEORY I                  Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:                   (Instr. B)        Spring 2009                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  6                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   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  4.50  4.07   4.32 4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   4  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  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   5  4.50   398/1434  4.50  4.34   4.14 4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50   527/1547  4.50  4.35   4.19 4.24  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   4   2  4.33  1262/1574  4.33  4.47   4.64 4.75  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0   1   1   0   0  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  4.50  1210/1493  4.67  4.85   4.73 4.80  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0   0   1   1   0   0  2.50  1471/1486  3.50  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  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

                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       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  5.00  ****/  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   2  4.00   185/ 382  4.00  3.52   4.08 4.13  4.00
```

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 6   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   1   A   2   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   4   Major   6
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   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 significant
                                            I   0   Other   6
                                            ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENEE 622  0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  677
Title      INFORM THEORY                            Baltimore County                                        JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    CHANG, CHEIN-I                          Spring 2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires:  7                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2   0   0  2  0  2  1  3.40 1482/1576  3.40  4.33  4.30 4.43  3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0   0  3  2  0  0  2.40 1570/1576  2.40  4.10  4.27 4.32  2.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0   0  1  3  0  1  3.20 1279/1342  3.20  4.07  4.32 4.38  3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   0   1  1  1  2  0  2.80 1493/1520  2.80  4.04  4.25 4.36  2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  1  1  2  1  3.60 1208/1465  3.60  4.07  4.12 4.25  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1   0  0  0  3  1  4.25  682/1434  4.25  4.34  4.14 4.35  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   1  0  2  2  0  3.00 1459/1547  3.00  4.35  4.19 4.24  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0   0  0  3  2  0  3.40 1562/1574  3.40  4.47  4.64 4.75  3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0  2  0  1  0  2.67 1514/1554  2.67  4.06  4.10 4.18  2.67

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0  0  1  3  1  4.00 1233/1488  4.00  4.45  4.47 4.52  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0  0  0  2  3  4.60 1125/1493  4.60  4.85  4.73 4.80  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0  2  1  1  1  3.20 1392/1486  3.20  4.12  4.32 4.37  3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   1  0  0  3  1  3.60 1298/1489  3.60  4.03  4.32 4.38  3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  3   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1277  ****  4.44  4.03 4.08  ****

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   4  0  1  0  0  1.40 1277/1279  1.40  4.13  4.17 4.34  1.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   4  0  1  0  0  1.40 1269/1270  1.40  4.32  4.35 4.53  1.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0   2  1  1  0  0  1.75 1268/1269  1.75  4.36  4.35 4.55  1.75

             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
```

```
                                        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      1       Major       4
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B    4
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0        C    0       General              1     Under-grad    6       Non-major   3
  84-150    0        3.00-3.49   0        D    0
  Grad.     1        3.50-4.00   2        F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                3
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENEE 631  0101                  University of Maryland                                   Page  678
Title       SEMICOND DEVICES                     Baltimore County                                        JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  CHOA, FOW-SEN                        Spring 2009                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
Questionnaires:  2                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   637/1576  4.50  4.33  4.30 4.43  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   608/1576  4.50  4.10  4.27 4.32  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   583/1342  4.50  4.07  4.32 4.38  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00  1041/1520  4.00  4.04  4.25 4.36  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00   850/1465  4.00  4.07  4.12 4.25  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1   0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1434  5.00  4.34  4.14 4.35  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50   527/1547  4.50  4.35  4.19 4.24  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1574  5.00  4.47  4.64 4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00   924/1554  4.00  4.06  4.10 4.18  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  0  0  2  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  2  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  0  1  1  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  1  1  4.50   696/1489  4.50  4.03  4.32 4.38  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00   692/1277  4.00  4.44  4.03 4.08  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  1  1  0  3.50  1064/1279  3.50  4.13  4.17 4.34  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1270  5.00  4.32  4.35 4.53  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1269  5.00  4.36  4.35 4.55  5.00

                 Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      1   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00   313/ 382  3.00  3.52  4.08 4.13  3.00

                                        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       1
   28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0      B    0
   56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0      C    0      General               0    Under-grad   2     Non-major   1
   84-150    0        3.00-3.49   0      D    0
   Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   1      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENEE 635  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  679
Title       INTRO OPTICAL COMM                   Baltimore County                                      JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    CHEN, YUNG JUI                       Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                    NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   0   0   4   1  4.20 1019/1576  4.20  4.33  4.30  4.43  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  476/1576  4.60  4.10  4.27  4.32  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   3   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  972/1342  4.00  4.07  4.32  4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  395/1520  4.60  4.04  4.25  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  4.07  4.12  4.25  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1   0   0   1   2   1  4.00  878/1434  4.00  4.34  4.14  4.35  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  411/1547  4.60  4.35  4.19  4.24  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0   5  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.47  4.64  4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 2   0   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
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0   0   0   0   3   0  4.00  802/1279  4.00  4.13  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  4.35  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  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.50  4.69  4.77  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  4.00  4.64  4.70  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.61  4.70  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                4   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  180/ 375  4.00  4.01  4.01  4.10  4.00


              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  5.00 ****/  24  ****  5.00  4.83  4.80  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      5   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  4.00  4.67  4.33  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     4   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 382  ****  3.52  4.08  4.13  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENEE 661  8010            University of Maryland                              Page  680
Title        SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI        Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  TAYLOR, RICHARD               Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 20                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                      NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  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  3.40 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  4.35  4.53  4.05  4.11  4.35

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/ 234  ****  3.79  4.23  4.36  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.30  4.35  4.37  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 229  ****  3.86  4.51  4.51  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 232  ****  4.40  4.29  4.47  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 379  ****  4.41  4.20  4.37  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  85  ****  5.00  4.72  4.79  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.50  4.69  4.77  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  72  ****  4.00  4.64  4.70  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.50  4.61  4.70  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  141/ 375  4.75  4.01  4.01  4.10  4.75

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  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  5.00 ****/  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                    University of Maryland                         Page  680
Title           SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI             Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:     TAYLOR, RICHARD                    Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 20                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                 Type                      Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     3             0.00-0.99   2      A   18           Required for Majors   0      Graduate    14        Major        0
 28-55     0             1.00-1.99   0      B    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
                                            P    0                                        responses to be significant
                                            I    0           Other                17
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENEE 670  8010                    University of Maryland                                    Page  681
Title          SYST ENGR PROJ                       Baltimore County                                       JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    HOCH, PETER                            Spring 2009                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  6                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                   Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                   General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  6  0  4.00 1148/1576  4.00  4.33  4.30  4.43  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  3  0  3.50 1392/1576  3.50  4.10  4.27  4.32  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   4  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  972/1342  4.00  4.07  4.32  4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  5  0  4.00 1041/1520  4.00  4.04  4.25  4.36  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  323/1434  4.60  4.34  4.14  4.35  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  924/1547  4.17  4.35  4.19  4.24  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.47  4.64  4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  2  3  0  3.60 1267/1554  3.60  4.06  4.10  4.18  3.60


                   Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25 1111/1488  4.25  4.45  4.47  4.52  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  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  2  1  2  4.00 1101/1486  4.00  4.12  4.32  4.37  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1118/1489  4.00  4.03  4.32  4.38  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/1277  ****  4.44  4.03  4.08  ****


                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  712/1279  4.20  4.13  4.17  4.34  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  559/1270  4.60  4.32  4.35  4.53  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  852/1269  4.20  4.36  4.35  4.55  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   4  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.53  4.05  4.11  ****


                   Seminar
5. Were criteria 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


                   Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  3   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 326  5.00  3.95  4.03  4.10  5.00


                   Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      3   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 382  5.00  3.52  4.08  4.13  5.00
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENEE 671  8010                    University of Maryland                              Page  682
Title       SER ORIENTED ARCHITECT                  Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   HOCH, PETER                             Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  7                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  1  1  1  4  0  3.14 1520/1576  3.14  4.33  4.30 4.43  3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  2  3  2  0  3.00 1523/1576  3.00  4.10  4.27 4.32  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  4  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 1329/1342  2.67  4.07  4.32 4.38  2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  1  3  1  1  1  2.71 1503/1520  2.71  4.04  4.25 4.36  2.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  1  2  2  3.43 1282/1465  3.43  4.07  4.12 4.25  3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2  1  2  0  2  2.86 1397/1434  2.86  4.34  4.14 4.35  2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  805/1547  4.29  4.35  4.19 4.24  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.47  4.64 4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  2  4  0  3.67 1227/1554  3.67  4.06  4.10 4.18  3.67

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  970/1488  4.43  4.45  4.47 4.52  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  986/1493  4.71  4.85  4.73 4.80  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  7  0  4.00 1101/1486  4.00  4.12  4.32 4.37  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  1  0  1  5  0  3.43 1338/1489  3.43  4.03  4.32 4.38  3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  623/1277  4.14  4.44  4.03 4.08  4.14

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  641/1279  4.29  4.13  4.17 4.34  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1270  5.00  4.32  4.35 4.53  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  332/1269  4.86  4.36  4.35 4.55  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   0  4  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  322/ 878  4.33  4.53  4.05 4.11  4.33

               Seminar
5. Were criteria for 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 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      6  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 382  ****  3.52  4.08 4.13  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENEE 683  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  683
Title      LASERS                            Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   YAN, LI                           Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      4
Questionnaires:  3                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  861/1576  4.33  4.33  4.30  4.43  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 1138/1576  4.00  4.10  4.27  4.32  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  770/1342  4.33  4.07  4.32  4.38  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 1041/1520  4.00  4.04  4.25  4.36  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00  850/1465  4.00  4.07  4.12  4.25  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 1  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.34  4.14  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1041/1547  4.00  4.35  4.19  4.24  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  911/1574  4.67  4.47  4.64  4.75  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00    1/1554  5.00  4.06  4.10  4.18  5.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  666/1488  4.67  4.45  4.47  4.52  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.85  4.73  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  468/1486  4.67  4.12  4.32  4.37  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.03  4.32  4.38  5.00


             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  4.17  4.34  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  636/1270  4.50  4.32  4.35  4.53  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50  644/1269  4.50  4.36  4.35  4.55  4.50


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  229/ 379  4.00  4.41  4.20  4.37  4.00


             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 1  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  287/ 375  3.00  4.01  4.01  4.10  3.00


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00   52/  52  1.00  1.50  4.48  4.40  1.00


             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  4.08  4.13  3.00

                                            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        Major       3
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0         B   2
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0         C   0         General               0        Under-grad    1        Non-major   0
 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
                                          P   0                                        responses to be significant
                                          I   0         Other                 1
                                          ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENEE 718D 0101             University of Maryland                            Page 684
Title        TOPICS IN SIGNAL PROCE         Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  RUTLEDGE, JANET                Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  8                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  0  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  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  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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  1  0  2  4 4.29  805/1547   4.29  4.35  4.19 4.24  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  5  3 4.38 1227/1574   4.38  4.47  4.64 4.75  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1554   5.00  4.06  4.10 4.18  5.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  0  7 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  7 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  1  6 4.86  221/1486   4.86  4.12  4.32 4.37  4.86
4. Did 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
5. Did 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


             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

                                           Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0      A    7      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      2    Major       3
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0      B    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 significant
                                       I    0      Other                3
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENEE 728C 0101              University of Maryland                                Page  685
Title       ADV CODING TOPICS & AP          Baltimore County                                     JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    MORRIS, JOEL                     Spring 2009                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    2
Questionnaires: 2                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  637/1576   4.50  4.33  4.30  4.43  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 1392/1576   3.50  4.10  4.27  4.32  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 1341/1342   2.00  4.07  4.32  4.38  2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1041/1520   4.00  4.04  4.25  4.36  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1465   5.00  4.07  4.12  4.25  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1434   5.00  4.34  4.14  4.35  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00 1459/1574   4.00  4.47  4.64  4.75  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   0   0   0   1   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   1   0   0   0  2.00 1484/1488   2.00  4.45  4.47  4.52  2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 1210/1493   4.50  4.85  4.73  4.80  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1421/1486   3.00  4.12  4.32  4.37  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 1489/1489   1.00  4.03  4.32  4.38  1.00

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  445/1279   4.50  4.13  4.17  4.34  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1270   5.00  4.32  4.35  4.53  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1269   5.00  4.36  4.35  4.55  5.00

             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0   0   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  229/ 379   4.00  4.41  4.20  4.37  4.00

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/  40   5.00  4.63  4.60  4.50  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      1   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00   34/  35   2.00  4.00  4.67  4.33  2.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       1   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00   26/  28   4.00  4.67  4.78  4.75  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  0      Graduate    2       Major       2
28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B   0
56-83      0       2.00-2.99   0       C   1       General              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       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                0
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENEE 788I 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  686
Title      TOPICS IN ELECTROPHYSI         Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN                 Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
Questionnaires: 5                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions               NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1  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     1  0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1138/1576  4.00  4.10  4.27  4.32  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  1  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     1  0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1041/1520  4.00  4.04  4.25  4.36  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  4  0  4.00  850/1465  4.00  4.07  4.12  4.25  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.34  4.14  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  339/1547  4.67  4.35  4.19  4.24  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  758/1574  4.75  4.47  4.64  4.75  4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1554  ****  4.06  4.10  4.18  ****


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  505/1488  4.75  4.45  4.47  4.52  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  0  4  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  2  4.50  678/1486  4.50  4.12  4.32  4.37  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  955/1489  4.25  4.03  4.32  4.38  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  309/1277  4.50  4.44  4.03  4.08  4.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage 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
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.53  4.05  4.11  ****


            Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   77/ 379  4.50  4.41  4.20  4.37  4.50


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 2  0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00  287/ 375  3.00  4.01  4.01  4.10  3.00


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  3  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  180/ 326  3.50  3.95  4.03  4.10  3.50


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      4  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 382  ****  3.52  4.08  4.13  ****

                               Frequency Distribution


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


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                      General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0   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   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   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

                                        Frequency Distribution

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          B    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    0          Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other                1
                                           ?    0
```