

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	5	15	4.23	889/1447	4.23	4.49	4.31	4.32	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	11	6	6	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.31	4.27	4.23	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	10	8	5	3.54	1134/1241	3.54	4.20	4.33	4.33	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	2	5	6	5	3.63	1215/1402	3.63	4.18	4.24	4.24	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	905/1358	3.92	4.20	4.11	4.10	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	774/1316	4.07	4.42	4.14	4.13	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	9	6	7	3.58	1237/1427	3.58	4.12	4.19	4.15	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	4	15	2	1	2.91	1377/1434	2.91	4.14	4.10	4.09	2.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	8	8	8	3.92	1217/1387	3.92	4.50	4.46	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	4	15	4.42	1197/1387	4.42	4.77	4.73	4.71	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	5	9	4	2	2.79	1345/1386	2.79	4.23	4.32	4.30	2.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	4	5	5	3	2.71	1344/1380	2.71	4.20	4.32	4.32	2.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	2	7	2	6	3.56	943/1193	3.56	4.19	4.02	4.05	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/1172	****	4.54	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	****/1182	****	4.66	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/1170	****	4.61	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.46	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	154/ 189	3.89	3.89	4.34	4.26	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	166/ 192	3.76	3.76	4.34	4.20	3.76
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	38/ 186	4.82	4.82	4.48	4.36	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	2	3	2	10	4.18	133/ 187	4.18	4.18	4.33	4.11	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	95/ 168	4.18	4.18	4.20	4.02	4.18
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	4.50	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 8	Required for Majors 23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D 2	Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 26
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough					

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

Course-Section: ENEE 622 1
 Title Inform Theory
 Instructor: Morris,Joel M
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 597
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	936/1447	4.18	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1239/1447	3.73	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	3	1	2	3.00	1215/1241	3.00	4.20	4.33	4.38	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	1249/1402	3.55	4.18	4.24	4.29	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.20	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1026/1316	3.70	4.42	4.14	4.34	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1374/1427	2.82	4.12	4.19	4.25	2.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1240/1447	4.27	4.77	4.69	4.74	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	1283/1434	3.38	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1268/1387	3.73	4.50	4.46	4.51	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	1304/1387	4.09	4.77	4.73	4.81	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1296/1386	3.27	4.23	4.32	4.43	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	0	3.09	1312/1380	3.09	4.20	4.32	4.38	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	0	5	0	2.89	1119/1193	2.89	4.19	4.02	4.02	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	487/1172	4.38	4.54	4.15	4.32	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.66	4.35	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	679/1170	4.38	4.61	4.38	4.52	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	169/ 800	4.57	4.46	4.06	4.10	4.57
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.76	4.34	4.79	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.00	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	5.00	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	4.50	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: ENEE 622 1
 Title Inform Theory
 Instructor: Morris,Joel M
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 597
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	3	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 624 1
 Title Error Corr Codes
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 598
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.20	4.11	4.26	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.42	4.14	4.34	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	931/1387	4.38	4.50	4.46	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.88	4.20	4.32	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.19	4.02	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	619/1172	4.20	4.54	4.15	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.66	4.35	4.46	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.61	4.38	4.52	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.46	4.06	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.89	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	3.76	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.82	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.18	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.18	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	5.00	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.00	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.00	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.71	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	24/ 31	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.85	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	15/ 21	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.65	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.59	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	15/ 20	4.50	4.50	4.60	4.56	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: ENEE 624 1
 Title Error Corr Codes
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 598
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 631 1
 Title Semicond Devices
 Instructor: Chen,Yung J
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 599
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.31	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.20	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.20	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.42	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.12	4.19	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.14	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.20	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.19	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.54	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.66	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.61	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.46	4.06	4.10	5.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	5.00	4.56	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.75	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	53/ 65	4.00	4.00	4.42	4.64	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	36/ 64	4.00	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 661 01
 Title System Archit And Desi
 Instructor: Taylor, Richard
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 600
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	695/1447	4.43	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	872/1447	4.24	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	923/1241	4.00	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	8	4	3.57	1138/1358	3.57	4.20	4.11	4.26	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	608/1316	4.26	4.42	4.14	4.34	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	568/1427	4.43	4.12	4.19	4.25	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	565/1434	4.32	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.50	4.46	4.51	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	496/1386	4.62	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	534/1380	4.62	4.20	4.32	4.38	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	408/1193	4.35	4.19	4.02	4.02	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.54	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	480/1182	4.61	4.66	4.35	4.46	4.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.61	4.38	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	313/ 800	4.29	4.46	4.06	4.10	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 18	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 9 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	889/1447	4.24	4.49	4.31	4.46	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	7	8	6	3.95	1097/1447	3.95	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	798/1241	4.24	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.18	4.24	4.29	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	7	7	3.95	858/1358	3.95	4.20	4.11	4.26	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	423/1316	4.48	4.42	4.14	4.34	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	2	14	4.29	739/1427	4.29	4.12	4.19	4.25	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	15	1	3.94	929/1434	3.94	4.14	4.10	4.21	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.50	4.46	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	656/1387	4.85	4.77	4.73	4.81	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	911/1386	4.21	4.23	4.32	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	775/1380	4.38	4.20	4.32	4.38	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	376/1193	4.40	4.19	4.02	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	10	6	4.17	637/1172	4.17	4.54	4.15	4.32	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	604/1182	4.44	4.66	4.35	4.46	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	549/1170	4.56	4.61	4.38	4.52	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	244/ 800	4.41	4.46	4.06	4.10	4.41
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	3.76	4.34	4.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.50	4.72	4.85	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 11 Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENEE 683 1
 Title Lasers
 Instructor: Yan, Li
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 602
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.49	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.20	4.33	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.20	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.42	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.12	4.19	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.74	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.50	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.23	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.20	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.19	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.54	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.66	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.61	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.46	4.06	4.10	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	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 4	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				