Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101   University of Maryland
Title   PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN   Baltimore County
Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID   Fall 2005
Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 11   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	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	607/1674	4.44	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1340/1674	3.64	4.09	4.23	4.26	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	0	4	2	3.30	1323/1423	3.38	4.00	4.27	4.36	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1224/1609	3.73	4.06	4.22	4.23	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1084/1585	4.14	3.97	3.96	3.91	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1535	3.82	4.05	4.08	4.03	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1097/1651	4.15	4.05	4.18	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1203/1673	4.43	4.38	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1162/1656	3.71	3.93	4.07	4.10	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	4.81	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.85	4.66	4.69	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1079/1582	4.33	4.20	4.26	4.35	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	1010/1575	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.39	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	1196/1380	3.40	3.83	3.94	4.03	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	1	2	2.90	1415/1520	3.39	3.85	4.01	4.03	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	4	1	3	3.50	1303/1515	3.58	3.94	4.24	4.28	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1359/1511	3.51	4.01	4.27	4.28	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	881/ 994	2.96	3.75	3.94	3.98	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	223/ 265	4.04	4.27	4.23	4.34	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	211/ 278	4.03	4.13	4.19	4.36	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	166/ 260	4.18	3.77	4.46	4.51	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	62/ 259	4.37	3.95	4.33	4.42	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	130/ 233	4.04	3.88	4.20	4.48	4.17
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	4.09	4.23	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

```
P    0                                            responses to be significant
I    0              Other              10
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 212  0102              University of Maryland                        Page  384
Title       PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN              Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   BOURNER, DAVID  (Instr. A)         Fall   2005                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 19                    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  3  5 10  4.39  792/1674  4.44  4.44  4.27  4.32  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  1  2  4  5  6  3.72 1388/1674  3.64  4.09  4.23  4.26  3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  2  3  4  6  3  3.28 1328/1423  3.38  4.00  4.27  4.36  3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  6  1  1  0  5  5  4.00 1094/1609  3.73  4.06  4.22  4.23  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  1  0  0  5  2  9  4.25  557/1585  4.14  3.97  3.96  3.91  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4  0  1  3  5  4  3.92  991/1535  3.82  4.05  4.08  4.03  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2  0  0  1  1  7  8  4.29  820/1651  4.15  4.05  4.18  4.20  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  1  0  1  1  6  9  4.35 1347/1673  4.43  4.38  4.69  4.67  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0  1  6  4  3  3.64 1308/1656  3.71  3.93  4.07  4.10  3.82


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3  0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  266/1586  4.81  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3  0  0  0  0  3 13  4.81  786/1585  4.85  4.66  4.69  4.76  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  3  5  8  4.31  871/1582  4.33  4.20  4.26  4.35  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3  0  0  2  1  1 12  4.44  780/1575  4.50  4.33  4.27  4.39  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2  1  0  6  3  4  3.64  974/1380  3.40  3.83  3.94  4.03  3.72


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  4  1  6  5  3.75 1027/1520  3.39  3.85  4.01  4.03  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  3  3  5  5  3.75 1209/1515  3.58  3.94  4.24  4.28  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  1  2  4  4  5  3.63 1282/1511  3.51  4.01  4.27  4.28  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   3 10  1  1  2  0  2  3.17  857/ 994  2.96  3.75  3.94  3.98  3.17


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   5  0  0  0  1  7  6  4.36  129/ 265  4.04  4.27  4.23  4.34  4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0  0  1  2  4  7  4.21  160/ 278  4.03  4.13  4.19  4.36  4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0  0  1  1  3  9  4.43  154/ 260  4.18  3.77  4.46  4.51  4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            5  0  0  1  2  2  9  4.36  139/ 259  4.37  3.95  4.33  4.42  4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  5  2  0  1  3  3  5  4.00  150/ 233  4.04  3.88  4.20  4.48  4.00


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     17 0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 17 0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.63  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  18 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.82  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.50  ****
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA          Expected Grades            Reasons                   Type                        Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0        A    5          Required for Majors   0      Graduate    0          Major        0
 28-55      5         1.00-1.99    0        B   13
 56-83      4         2.00-2.99    2        C    0          General               0      Under-grad  19         Non-major    3
 84-150     1         3.00-3.49    6        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                16
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 212  0102            University of Maryland                              Page  385
Title        PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN       Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  BOURNER, DAVID  (Instr. B)        Fall   2005                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 19                        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  3  5 10  4.39  792/1674  4.44  4.44  4.27 4.32  4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  1  2  4  5  6  3.72 1388/1674  3.64  4.09  4.23 4.26  3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  2  3  4  6  3  3.28 1328/1423  3.38  4.00  4.27 4.36  3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  6  1  1  0  5  5  4.00 1094/1609  3.73  4.06  4.22 4.23  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1  0  0  5  2  9  4.25  557/1585  4.14  3.97  3.96 3.91  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 4 0 1 3 5 4  3.92  991/1535  3.82  4.05  4.08 4.03  3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  0  1  1  7  8  4.29  820/1651  4.15  4.05  4.18 4.20  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  1  1  6  9  4.35 1347/1673  4.43  4.38  4.69 4.67  4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 0 0 2 2 2  4.00  955/1656  3.71  3.93  4.07 4.10  3.82


        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        14  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  389/1586  4.81  4.38  4.43 4.48  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   14  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  811/1585  4.85  4.66  4.69 4.76  4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  777/1582  4.33  4.20  4.26 4.35  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     14  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  579/1575  4.50  4.33  4.27 4.39  4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14 0 0 0 2 2 1  3.80  866/1380  3.40  3.83  3.94 4.03  3.72


        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  4  1  6  5  3.75 1027/1520  3.39  3.85  4.01 4.03  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  3  3  5  5  3.75 1209/1515  3.58  3.94  4.24 4.28  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1 2 4 4 5  3.63 1282/1511  3.51  4.01  4.27 4.28  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  3 10  1  1  2  0  2  3.17  857/ 994  2.96  3.75  3.94 3.98  3.17


        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5  0  0  0  1  7  6  4.36  129/ 265  4.04  4.27  4.23 4.34  4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 1 2 4 7  4.21  160/ 278  4.03  4.13  4.19 4.36  4.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 1 1 3 9  4.43  154/ 260  4.18  3.77  4.46 4.51  4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5  0  0  1  2  2  9  4.36  139/ 259  4.37  3.95  4.33 4.42  4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5  2  0  1  3  3  5  4.00  150/ 233  4.04  3.88  4.20 4.48  4.00


        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 2 0  4.00 ****/ 103  **** ****  4.41 4.07  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/ 101  **** ****  4.48 4.45  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 1 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  95  **** ****  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  99  **** ****  4.39 4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  97  **** ****  4.14 4.63  ****


        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  76  **** ****  3.98 3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  77  **** ****  3.93 4.20  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  **** ****  4.45 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.12 4.50  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  49  **** ****  4.27 4.82  ****


        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  61  **** ****  4.09 4.23  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  **** ****  4.26 4.53  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  **** ****  4.44 4.42  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  **** ****  4.36 4.63  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.34 4.50  ****
```

Title   PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN   Baltimore County   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: BOURNER, DAVID (Instr. B)   Fall   2005   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 19   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   5   Required for Majors 0   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   5   1.00-1.99   0   B   13
 56-83   4   2.00-2.99   2   C   0   General   0   Under-grad 19   Non-major   3
 84-150   1   3.00-3.49   6   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   16
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: CMPE 212  0103                University of Maryland                              Page  386
Title        PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN              Baltimore County                              JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  BOURNER, DAVID                      Fall   2005                                   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    0   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50   607/1674  4.44  4.44  4.27  4.32  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   1   1   1   1   2  3.33  1559/1674  3.64  4.09  4.23  4.26  3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   1   2  3.67  1214/1423  3.38  4.00  4.27  4.36  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   0   0   3   0   0  3.00  1557/1609  3.73  4.06  4.22  4.23  3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   482/1585  4.14  3.97  3.96  3.91  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1   1   0   1   1   2  3.60  1240/1535  3.82  4.05  4.08  4.03  3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   1   1   3  4.00  1097/1651  4.15  4.05  4.18  4.20  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  1203/1673  4.43  4.38  4.69  4.67  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0   0   2   1   0  3.33  1444/1656  3.71  3.93  4.07  4.10  3.33


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   496/1586  4.81  4.38  4.43  4.48  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1585  4.85  4.66  4.69  4.76  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   0   0   2   2  4.50   632/1582  4.33  4.20  4.26  4.35  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   359/1575  4.50  4.33  4.27  4.39  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0   1   0   2   0   1  3.00  1217/1380  3.40  3.83  3.94  4.03  3.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   1   4   0   1  3.17  1315/1520  3.39  3.85  4.01  4.03  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0   1   3   1   1  3.33  1361/1515  3.58  3.94  4.24  4.28  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0   1   3   0   2  3.50  1308/1511  3.51  4.01  4.27  4.28  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   4   0   1   1   0   0  2.50   964/ 994  2.96  3.75  3.94  3.98  2.50


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   0   0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83   205/ 265  4.04  4.27  4.23  4.34  3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83   215/ 278  4.03  4.13  4.19  4.36  3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0  0   0   1   2   2   1  3.50   245/ 260  4.18  3.77  4.46  4.51  3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            0   0   0   0   3   0   3  4.00   191/ 259  4.37  3.95  4.33  4.42  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   1   0   0   2   1   2  4.00   150/ 233  4.04  3.88  4.20  4.48  4.00


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  5   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  3.97  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  5   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.20  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades           Reasons                Type                    Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0         0.00-0.99   0         A    0       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0       Major        0
 28-55     0         1.00-1.99   0         B    5                                   
 56-83     1         2.00-2.99   0         C    0       General              0      Under-grad    6       Non-major    0
 84-150    0         3.00-3.49   0         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                4
                                           ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 314  0101              University of Maryland                                  Page  387
Title        PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR         Baltimore County                                      JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  YAN, LI                        Fall  2005                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
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  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1674   5.00  4.44  4.27  4.26  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  191/1674   4.83  4.09  4.23  4.21  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1423   5.00  4.00  4.27  4.27  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  490/1609   4.50  4.06  4.22  4.27  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1585   5.00  3.97  3.96  3.95  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1535   5.00  4.05  4.08  4.15  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  4  3 4.43  643/1651   4.43  4.05  4.18  4.16  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1673   5.00  4.38  4.69  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0  0  0  2  3 4.60  310/1656   4.60  3.93  4.07  4.07  4.60

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  581/1586   4.71  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  689/1585   4.86  4.66  4.69  4.66  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  366/1582   4.71  4.20  4.26  4.26  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  225/1575   4.86  4.33  4.27  4.25  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  143/1380   4.75  3.83  3.94  4.01  4.75

            Discussion
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1515   ****  3.94  4.24  4.32  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/1511   ****  4.01  4.27  4.34  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   2  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80   35/ 265   4.80  4.27  4.23  4.26  4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0  0  0  0  2  3 4.60   72/ 278   4.60  4.13  4.19  4.24  4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0  0  0  0  2  3 4.60  119/ 260   4.60  3.77  4.46  4.49  4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            2  0  0  0  1  1  3 4.40  130/ 259   4.40  3.95  4.33  4.33  4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80   33/ 233   4.80  3.88  4.20  4.18  4.80

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades       Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A    5       Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0     Major        0
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    0
  56-83      3      2.00-2.99    1       C    0       General              0    Under-grad    7     Non-major    1
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49    0       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                6
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 323  0101                  University of Maryland                                      Page  388
Title          SIGNAL/SYSTEMS THEORY              Baltimore County                                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    THOMAS, JOSEPH                        Fall   2005                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      13
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  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   195/1674   4.86  4.44  4.27  4.26  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43   705/1674   4.43  4.09  4.23  4.21  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   672/1423   4.43  4.00  4.27  4.27  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   5  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   490/1609   4.50  4.06  4.22  4.27  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  0  0  0  3  1  4.25   557/1585   4.25  3.97  3.96  3.95  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   238/1535   4.67  4.05  4.08  4.15  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43   643/1651   4.43  4.05  4.18  4.16  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  1015/1673   4.71  4.38  4.69  4.68  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0  0  0  5  0  4.00   955/1656   4.00  3.93  4.07  4.07  4.00

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   581/1586   4.71  4.38  4.43  4.42  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1585   5.00  4.66  4.69  4.66  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14  1043/1582   4.14  4.20  4.26  4.26  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   612/1575   4.57  4.33  4.27  4.25  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  5  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  1036/1380   3.50  3.83  3.94  4.01  3.50

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20   700/1520   4.20  3.85  4.01  4.09  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   543/1515   4.60  3.94  4.24  4.32  4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   414/1511   4.75  4.01  4.27  4.34  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   4  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/ 994   ****  3.75  3.94  3.96  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0          A    2        Required for Majors  0        Graduate     0        Major       0
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0          B    3
 56-83      1       2.00-2.99   0          C    2        General              6        Under-grad   7        Non-major   0
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49   2          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                1
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 413  0101          University of Maryland                                   Page  389
Title      PRINCIPLES VLSI DESIGN        Baltimore County                                        JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PATEL, CHINTAN  (Instr. A)        Fall   2005                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 14                       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   1   3   1   9  4.29   916/1674   4.61  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   5   7  4.36   803/1674   4.40  4.09  4.23  4.31  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   1   6   6  4.14   929/1423   4.26  4.00  4.27  4.34  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   1   2   4   4  4.00  1094/1609   4.28  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7   0   0   2   2   3  4.14   662/1585   3.90  3.97  3.96  4.01  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0   0   3   3   5  4.18   747/1535   4.09  4.05  4.08  4.18  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   0   3   3   5  3.92  1214/1651   4.11  4.05  4.18  4.23  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   7   6  4.36  1347/1673   4.29  4.38  4.69  4.67  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   2   4   6  4.33   615/1656   4.13  3.93  4.07  4.19  4.22

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   4   8  4.43   974/1586   4.17  4.38  4.43  4.46  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   3   2   9  4.43  1292/1585   4.44  4.66  4.69  4.76  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   3   3   7  4.14  1043/1582   4.24  4.20  4.26  4.31  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   4   4   6  4.14  1060/1575   4.21  4.33  4.27  4.35  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  1   1   0   3   9  4.29   463/1380   3.95  3.83  3.94  4.04  4.29

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   2   0   1   6   3  3.67  1092/1520   3.81  3.85  4.01  4.18  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   1   5   4   2  3.58  1279/1515   3.74  3.94  4.24  4.40  3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   1   5   2   4  3.75  1221/1511   3.85  4.01  4.27  4.45  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   7   0   0   1   2   2  4.20   390/ 994   3.99  3.75  3.94  4.19  4.20

          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/ 265   4.67  4.27  4.23  4.53  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0  0   0   0   2   6  4.75    41/ 278   4.52  4.13  4.19  4.21  4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0  1   3   0   1   3  3.25   255/ 260   3.55  3.77  4.46  4.24  3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   0   1   0   3   1   3  3.63   226/ 259   3.78  3.95  4.33  4.31  3.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6  0   0   1   4   0   3  3.63   201/ 233   3.78  3.88  4.20  4.10  3.63

          Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 101   ****  ****  4.48  4.65  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  95   ****  ****  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  99   ****  ****  4.39  4.57  ****

          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  76   ****  ****  3.98  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  77   ****  ****  3.93  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00  ****/  53   ****  ****  4.45  4.86  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  48   ****  ****  4.12  4.13  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  49   ****  ****  4.27  4.48  ****

          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  61   ****  ****  4.09  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  52   ****  ****  4.26  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  50   ****  ****  4.44  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  35   ****  ****  4.36  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  31   ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

                                         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   5
  56-83   0   2.00-2.99   1   C   2   General   0   Under-grad 14   Non-major 0
  84-150   9   3.00-3.49   7   D   0
  Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P   0   responses to be significant
                                             I   0   Other   13
                                             ?   2

```
Course-Section: CMPE 413  0101              University of Maryland                           Page  390
Title      PRINCIPLES VLSI DESIGN            Baltimore County                               JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PATEL, CHINTAN  (Instr. B)        Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 14                     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  1  3  1  9  4.29  916/1674  4.61  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  2  5  7  4.36  803/1674  4.40  4.09  4.23  4.31  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   1  0  1  6  6  4.14  929/1423  4.26  4.00  4.27  4.34  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3   0  1  2  4  4  4.00 1094/1609  4.28  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   0  0  2  2  3  4.14  662/1585  3.90  3.97  3.96  4.01  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  3  3  5  4.18  747/1535  4.09  4.05  4.08  4.18  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   1  0  3  3  5  3.92 1214/1651  4.11  4.05  4.18  4.23  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  1  7  6  4.36 1347/1673  4.29  4.38  4.69  4.67  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  827/1656  4.13  3.93  4.07  4.19  4.22


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        10   0   0  0  0  4  0  4.00 1300/1586  4.17  4.38  4.43  4.46  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   11   0   0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/1585  4.44  4.66  4.69  4.76  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12  0   0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1582  4.24  4.20  4.26  4.31  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     12   0   0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1575  4.21  4.33  4.27  4.35  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/1380  3.95  3.83  3.94  4.04  4.29


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   2  0  1  6  3  3.67 1092/1520  3.81  3.85  4.01  4.18  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0  1  5  4  2  3.58 1279/1515  3.74  3.94  4.24  4.40  3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  1  5  2  4  3.75 1221/1511  3.85  4.01  4.27  4.45  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   7   0  0  1  2  2  4.20  390/ 994  3.99  3.75  3.94  4.19  4.20


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   6   0   0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/ 265  4.67  4.27  4.23  4.53  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   41/ 278  4.52  4.13  4.19  4.21  4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0  1  3  1  1  3  3.25  255/ 260  3.55  3.77  4.46  4.24  3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            6   0   1  0  3  1  3  3.63  226/ 259  3.78  3.95  4.33  4.31  3.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6   0   0  1  4  0  3  3.63  201/ 233  3.78  3.88  4.20  4.10  3.63


            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.65  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.57  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       13   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.86  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   13   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.13  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.48  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    13   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      13   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       13   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 413  0101                University of Maryland                        Page  390
Title          PRINCIPLES VLSI DESIGN          Baltimore County                           JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PATEL, CHINTAN  (Instr. B)         Fall   2005                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 14                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       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   5
  56-83    0         2.00-2.99   1       C   2          General              0      Under-grad  14        Non-major   0
  84-150   9         3.00-3.49   7       D   0
  Grad.    0         3.50-4.00   3       F   0          Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                         I   0          Other               13
                                         ?   2
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 413  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  391
Title       PRINCIPLES VLSI DESIGN          Baltimore County                                JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PATEL, CHINTAN  (Instr. C)        Fall   2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 14                      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   1   3   1   9  4.29  916/1674  4.61  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   5   7  4.36  803/1674  4.40  4.09  4.23  4.31  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   1   6   6  4.14  929/1423  4.26  4.00  4.27  4.34  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   1   2   4   4  4.00 1094/1609  4.28  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7   0   0   2   2   3  4.14  662/1585  3.90  3.97  3.96  4.01  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2   0   0   3   3   5  4.18  747/1535  4.09  4.05  4.08  4.18  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0   1   0   3   3   5  3.92 1214/1651  4.11  4.05  4.18  4.23  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   7   6  4.36 1347/1673  4.29  4.38  4.69  4.67  4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0   0   1   3   2  4.17  827/1656  4.13  3.93  4.07  4.19  4.22


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       10   0   0   0   0   4   0  4.00 1300/1586  4.17  4.38  4.43  4.46  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  11   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 ****/1585  4.44  4.66  4.69  4.76  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12 0  0   0   0   2   0  4.00 ****/1582  4.24  4.20  4.26  4.31  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    12   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 ****/1575  4.21  4.33  4.27  4.35  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 0 0  1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/1380  3.95  3.83  3.94  4.04  4.29


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   2   0   1   6   3  3.67 1092/1520  3.81  3.85  4.01  4.18  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   1   5   4   2  3.58 1279/1515  3.74  3.94  4.24  4.40  3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   1   5   2   4  3.75 1221/1511  3.85  4.01  4.27  4.45  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   7   0   0   1   2   2  4.20  390/ 994  3.99  3.75  3.94  4.19  4.20


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/ 265  4.67  4.27  4.23  4.53  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0  0   0   2   6  4.75   41/ 278  4.52  4.13  4.19  4.21  4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0  1   3   0   1   3  3.25  255/ 260  3.55  3.77  4.46  4.24  3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   0   1   0   3   1   3  3.63  226/ 259  3.78  3.95  4.33  4.31  3.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6   0   0   1   4   0   3  3.63  201/ 233  3.78  3.88  4.20  4.10  3.63


            Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0  0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.65  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   13   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.57  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.24  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      13   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.86  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.13  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.48  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    13   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

                                              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   5
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   1   C   2   General   0   Under-grad 14   Non-major   0
 84-150   9   3.00-3.49   7   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   3   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P   0   responses to be significant
                                             I   0   Other   13
                                             ?   2

```
Course-Section: CMPE 413  0102                University of Maryland                                    Page  392
Title        PRINCIPLES VLSI DESIGN           Baltimore County                                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  PATEL, CHINTAN  (Instr. A)       Fall   2005                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires:  9                            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   8  4.89  167/1674  4.61  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67  379/1674  4.40  4.09  4.23  4.31  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   5  4.56  517/1423  4.26  4.00  4.27  4.34  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   6   3  4.33  743/1609  4.28  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0   2   0   3   1  3.50 1223/1585  3.90  3.97  3.96  4.01  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4   0   1   1   0   3  4.00  870/1535  4.09  4.05  4.08  4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   0   2   6  4.44  613/1651  4.11  4.05  4.18  4.23  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   6   3  4.33 1361/1673  4.29  4.38  4.69  4.67  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   1   0   0   2   3  4.00  955/1656  4.13  3.93  4.07  4.19  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   1   0   2   6  4.44  945/1586  4.17  4.38  4.43  4.46  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89  615/1585  4.44  4.66  4.69  4.76  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   1   0   1   6  4.50  632/1582  4.24  4.20  4.26  4.31  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   1   0   2   5  4.38  847/1575  4.21  4.33  4.27  4.35  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   2   3   1   3  3.56 1017/1380  3.95  3.83  3.94  4.04  3.56


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  489/1520  3.81  3.85  4.01  4.18  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   1   1   3   2  3.86 1158/1515  3.74  3.94  4.24  4.40  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43  729/1511  3.85  4.01  4.27  4.45  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   4   0   0   1   2   0  3.67  676/ 994  3.99  3.75  3.94  4.19  3.67


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   3   0   1   0   0   1   4  4.17  161/ 265  4.67  4.27  4.23  4.53  4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0   0   1   0   2   3  4.17  170/ 278  4.52  4.13  4.19  4.21  4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3  0   0   1   0   3   2  4.00  215/ 260  3.55  3.77  4.46  4.24  4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            3   0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00  191/ 259  3.78  3.95  4.33  4.31  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3   0   0   0   3   0   3  4.00  150/ 233  3.78  3.88  4.20  4.10  4.00


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.42  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.57  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.46  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.24  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.13  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.48  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        8   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      8   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

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	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMPE 413  0102                University of Maryland                        Page  393
Title       PRINCIPLES VLSI DESIGN            Baltimore County                             JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PATEL, CHINTAN  (Instr. B)        Fall   2005                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires:  9                       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   8  4.89  167/1674  4.61  4.44  4.27  4.42  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67  379/1674  4.40  4.09  4.23  4.31  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   5  4.56  517/1423  4.26  4.00  4.27  4.34  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   6   3  4.33  743/1609  4.28  4.06  4.22  4.30  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3   0   2   0   3   1  3.50 1223/1585  3.90  3.97  3.96  4.01  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 4   1   1   0   3  4.00  870/1535  4.09  4.05  4.08  4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   0   2   6  4.44  613/1651  4.11  4.05  4.18  4.23  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   6   3  4.33 1361/1673  4.29  4.38  4.69  4.67  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/1656  4.13  3.93  4.07  4.19  4.00

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         7   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1586  4.17  4.38  4.43  4.46  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    7   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/1585  4.44  4.66  4.69  4.76  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  850/1582  4.24  4.20  4.26  4.31  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  886/1575  4.21  4.33  4.27  4.35  4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7  0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/1380  3.95  3.83  3.94  4.04  3.56

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  489/1520  3.81  3.85  4.01  4.18  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   1   1   3   2  3.86 1158/1515  3.74  3.94  4.24  4.40  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43  729/1511  3.85  4.01  4.27  4.45  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   4   0   0   1   2   0  3.67  676/ 994  3.99  3.75  3.94  4.19  3.67

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   3   0   1   0   0   1   4  4.17  161/ 265  4.67  4.27  4.23  4.53  4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0   0   1   0   2   3  4.17  170/ 278  4.52  4.13  4.19  4.21  4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3  0   0   1   0   3   2  4.00  215/ 260  3.55  3.77  4.46  4.24  4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            3   0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00  191/ 259  3.78  3.95  4.33  4.31  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3   0   0   0   3   0   3  4.00  150/ 233  3.78  3.88  4.20  4.10  4.00

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.42  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.57  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.46  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.24  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.13  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  8   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.48  ****

                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        8   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      8   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

                                        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	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMPE 413  0103            University of Maryland                        Page  394
Title      PRINCIPLES VLSI DESIGN              Baltimore County                         JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   PATEL, CHINTAN                        Fall   2005                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    2
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   1/1674  4.61  4.44   4.27  4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1146/1674  4.40  4.09   4.23  4.31  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1016/1423  4.26  4.00   4.27  4.34  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00   1/1609  4.28  4.06   4.22  4.30  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  769/1585  3.90  3.97   3.96  4.01  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  870/1535  4.09  4.05   4.08  4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1097/1651  4.11  4.05   4.18  4.23  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1566/1673  4.29  4.38   4.69  4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  955/1656  4.13  3.93   4.07  4.19  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1300/1586  4.17  4.38   4.43  4.46  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1472/1585  4.44  4.66   4.69  4.76  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1129/1582  4.24  4.20   4.26  4.31  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1138/1575  4.21  4.33   4.27  4.35  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  666/1380  3.95  3.83   3.94  4.04  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1353/1520  3.81  3.85   4.01  4.18  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 1024/1515  3.74  3.94   4.24  4.40  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1420/1511  3.85  4.01   4.27  4.45  3.00


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   0        Required for Majors  0      Graduate    0       Major       0
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B   1
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1      C   0        General              0      Under-grad  1       Non-major   0
  84-150     0       3.00-3.49    0      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
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 415  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  395
Title      PROGRAM LOGIC DEVICES          Baltimore County                                  JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:  PLUSQUELLIC, JA              Fall   2005                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     55
Questionnaires:  24                    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  6  3  3  8  4 3.04 1623/1674  3.04  4.44  4.27 4.42  3.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  5  2  7  7  3 3.04 1604/1674  3.04  4.09  4.23 4.31  3.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  4  0  5  9  6 3.54 1260/1423  3.54  4.00  4.27 4.34  3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   3  3  1  7  5  4 3.30 1507/1609  3.30  4.06  4.22 4.30  3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   4  6  0  5  4  4 3.00 1440/1585  3.00  3.97  3.96 4.01  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 11  3  0  4  1  3 3.09 1428/1535  3.09  4.05  4.08 4.18  3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  6  2  4  6  5 3.09 1556/1651  3.09  4.05  4.18 4.23  3.09
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  1  1  4 11  6 3.87 1628/1673  3.87  4.38  4.69 4.67  3.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  3  4  5  5  3 3.05 1533/1656  3.05  3.93  4.07 4.19  3.05


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  4  1  6  9  3 3.26 1520/1586  3.26  4.38  4.43 4.46  3.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  3  1  2  6 11 3.91 1502/1585  3.91  4.66  4.69 4.76  3.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  2  2  6  9  4 3.48 1416/1582  3.48  4.20  4.26 4.31  3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1  7  2  3  7  3 2.86 1521/1575  2.86  4.33  4.27 4.35  2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  6  2  2  6  5  2 3.18 1187/1380  3.18  3.83  3.94 4.04  3.18


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18  0  2  1  0  3  0 2.67 1453/1520  2.67  3.85  4.01 4.18  2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18  0  1  2  0  2  1 3.00 1420/1515  3.00  3.94  4.24 4.40  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0  0  2  1  1  2 3.50 1308/1511  3.50  4.01  4.27 4.45  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   18  3  1  0  1  1  0 2.67 ****/ 994  ****  3.75  3.94 4.19  ****


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   17  0  2  0  1  2  2 3.29  251/ 265  3.29  4.27  4.23 4.53  3.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0  2  1  1  2  1 2.86  266/ 278  2.86  4.13  4.19 4.21  2.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0  3  0  0  3  1 2.86  259/ 260  2.86  3.77  4.46 4.24  2.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            17  1  3  0  1  0  2 2.67  258/ 259  2.67  3.95  4.33 4.31  2.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  17  0  3  1  1  1  1 2.43  233/ 233  2.43  3.88  4.20 4.10  2.43


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  23  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98 4.86  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  23  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93 4.24  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 23  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09 5.00  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0      A    9       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0     Major       0
  28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0      B    9
  56-83     2      2.00-2.99    1      C    1       General              3     Under-grad   24     Non-major   0
  84-150   13      3.00-3.49    7      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   11      F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               22
                                       ?    4
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 419  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  396
Title         COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL          Baltimore County                                   JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:   PHATAK, DHANANJ                 Fall  2005                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      11
Questionnaires:  10                      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  3  7 4.70  367/1674  4.70 4.44  4.27 4.42 4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  3  3  4 4.10 1077/1674  4.10 4.09  4.23 4.31 4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  1  2  3  4 4.00 1016/1423  4.00 4.00  4.27 4.34 4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  0  3  2  3 4.00 1094/1609  4.00 4.06  4.22 4.30 4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 1 2 2 4 4.00 769/1585 4.00 3.97 3.96 4.01 4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 1 3 3 3.78 1132/1535 3.78 4.05 4.08 4.18 3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  5  0  2  3 3.30 1513/1651  3.30 4.05  4.18 4.23 3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  1  9 4.90  706/1673  4.90 4.38  4.69 4.67 4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 6 1 4.14 849/1656 4.14 3.93 4.07 4.19 4.14


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  1  0  6  3 4.10 1250/1586  4.10 4.38  4.43 4.46 4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  1  0  9 4.80  811/1585  4.80 4.66  4.69 4.76 4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 3 2 4 3.90 1217/1582 3.90 4.20 4.26 4.31 3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  1  2  7 4.60  579/1575  4.60 4.33  4.27 4.35 4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 2 1 1 4 3.88 817/1380 3.88 3.83 3.94 4.04 3.88


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 191/1520 4.80 3.85 4.01 4.18 4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 325/1515 4.80 3.94 4.24 4.40 4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 358/1511 4.80 4.01 4.27 4.45 4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  2  0  0  1  1  1 4.00  474/ 994  4.00 3.75  3.94 4.19 4.00


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2        0.00-0.99   0        A    5        Required for Majors  0      Graduate    1       Major       0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B    2
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99   0        C    1        General              5      Under-grad  9       Non-major   4
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49   0        D    0
 Grad.      1        3.50-4.00   2        F    0        Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                3
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 422  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  397
Title       DIGITAL SIGNAL PROCESS            Baltimore County                          JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: ADALI, TULAY                      Fall  2005                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     5
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   1   1   1  4.00 1196/1674  4.00  4.44  4.27 4.42  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33  830/1674  4.33  4.09  4.23 4.31  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 1214/1423  3.67  4.00  4.27 4.34  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0   0   0   0   2   0   1  3.67 1377/1609  3.67  4.06  4.22 4.30  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   1   1   1   0  3.00 1440/1585  3.00  3.97  3.96 4.01  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  870/1535  4.00  4.05  4.08 4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0   0   0   1   0   0   2  4.00 1097/1651  4.00  4.05  4.18 4.23  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33 1361/1673  4.33  4.38  4.69 4.67  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  1   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 1377/1656  3.50  3.93  4.07 4.19  3.50

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  663/1586  4.67  4.38  4.43 4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 1071/1585  4.67  4.66  4.69 4.76  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00 1129/1582  4.00  4.20  4.26 4.31  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  495/1575  4.67  4.33  4.27 4.35  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  303/1380  4.50  3.83  3.94 4.04  4.50

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1520  5.00  3.85  4.01 4.18  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1515  5.00  3.94  4.24 4.40  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/1511  5.00  4.01  4.27 4.45  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                    2   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00    1/ 994  5.00  3.75  3.94 4.19  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    0        0.00-0.99   0        A    0         Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0        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    1
  84-150   1        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                 0
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 640  0101              University of Maryland                            Page  398
Title      ADVANCED VLSI DESIGN             Baltimore County                                 JAN 21, 2006
Instructor:    PATEL, CHINTAN               Fall   2005                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires: 11                   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  0  1  3  6  4.18 1036/1674  4.18 4.44  4.27 4.44  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  0  0  6  4  4.09 1083/1674  4.09 4.09  4.23 4.34  4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  5  3  4.10  957/1423  4.10 4.00  4.27 4.28  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  0  0  2  4  4  4.20  930/1609  4.20 4.06  4.22 4.34  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  0  3  3  4  4.10  702/1585  4.10 3.97  3.96 4.23  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 5 3  4.10  828/1535  4.10 4.05  4.08 4.27  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  843/1651  4.27 4.05  4.18 4.32  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  2  5  3  4.10 1525/1673  4.10 4.38  4.69 4.78  4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 3 6  4.50  381/1656  4.50 3.93  4.07 4.15  4.50

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  0  0  2  8  4.45  931/1586  4.45 4.38  4.43 4.50  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  1  0  0  0 10  4.64 1106/1585  4.64 4.66  4.69 4.79  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 1 0 1 1 8    4.36  819/1582  4.36 4.20  4.26 4.33  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  2  1  8  4.55  646/1575  4.55 4.33  4.27 4.30  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 2 1 6   4.44  348/1380  4.44 3.83  3.94 3.85  4.44

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 5   4.57  355/1520  4.57 3.85  4.01 4.19  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 5   4.71  432/1515  4.71 3.94  4.24 4.47  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 2 5  4.71  458/1511  4.71 4.01  4.27 4.49  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  2  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  115/ 994  4.75 3.75  3.94 4.07  4.75

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  8  0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67  222/ 265  3.67 4.27  4.23 4.51  3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 1 0 0 1 1  3.33  253/ 278  3.33 4.13  4.19 4.42  3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 1 0 1   3.33  252/ 260  3.33 3.77  4.46 4.67  3.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           8  0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  191/ 259  4.00 3.95  4.33 4.66  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  108/ 233  4.33 3.88  4.20 4.53  4.33

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 1 0 0 0 0 1   5.00 ****/ 103  **** ****  4.41 4.56  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 1 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 101  **** ****  4.48 4.62  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9 1 0 0 0 1 0   4.00 ****/  95  **** ****  4.31 4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  99  **** ****  4.39 4.54  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  97  **** ****  4.14 4.26  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 0 1 0    2.50 ****/  76  **** ****  3.98 4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 10 0 0 0 0 1 0   4.00 ****/  77  **** ****  3.93 4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       9  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  53  **** ****  4.45 4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   9  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  48  **** ****  4.12 4.35  ****

                              Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27       2        0.00-0.99   1      A    3       Required for Majors  0     Graduate     5       Major       0
28-55       0        1.00-1.99   0      B    1
56-83       0        2.00-2.99   0      C    0       General              0     Under-grad   6       Non-major   2
84-150      1        3.00-3.49   3      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          7
?    3
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 646  0101              University of Maryland                                Page  399
Title      VLSI DESIGN VERIFICATI           Baltimore County                                     JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: Tehranipoor, Mo                 Fall   2005                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires: 15                     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  4  3  8  4.27  941/1674  4.27  4.44  4.27  4.44  4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  2  4  4  5  3.80 1340/1674  3.80  4.09  4.23  4.34  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  3  6  5  4.14  929/1423  4.14  4.00  4.27  4.28  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  2  0  0  3  3  6  4.25  852/1609  4.25  4.06  4.22  4.34  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  0  0  3  5  4  4.08  715/1585  4.08  3.97  3.96  4.23  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3  0  0  3  3  5  4.18  747/1535  4.18  4.05  4.08  4.27  4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  2  6  5  4.07 1050/1651  4.07  4.05  4.18  4.32  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  3  7  4  4.07 1537/1673  4.07  4.38  4.69  4.78  4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  3  2  5  3  3.62 1324/1656  3.62  3.93  4.07  4.15  3.62

                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  5  4  6  4.07 1270/1586  4.07  4.38  4.43  4.50  4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  5 10  4.67 1071/1585  4.67  4.66  4.69  4.79  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  1  3  5  6  4.07 1099/1582  4.07  4.20  4.26  4.33  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  3  5  6  4.07 1115/1575  4.07  4.33  4.27  4.30  4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  0  1  3  4  5  4.00  666/1380  4.00  3.83  3.94  3.85  4.00

                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0  0  1  1  6  2  3.90  924/1520  3.90  3.85  4.01  4.19  3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  0  1  1  4  4  4.10  993/1515  4.10  3.94  4.24  4.47  4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  927/1511  4.22  4.01  4.27  4.49  4.22
4. Were special techniques successful                  5  3  1  0  3  2  1  3.29  827/ 994  3.29  3.75  3.94  4.07  3.29

                  Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 13  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 265  ****  4.27  4.23  4.51  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 278  ****  4.13  4.19  4.42  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 260  ****  3.77  4.46  4.67  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 259  ****  3.95  4.33  4.66  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.88  4.20  4.53  ****

                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 103  ****  ****  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 0 0 0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 101  ****  ****  4.48  4.62  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  95  ****  ****  4.31  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  99  ****  ****  4.39  4.54  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.14  4.26  ****

                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  76  ****  ****  3.98  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  3.93  4.31  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.45  4.64  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.12  4.35  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  49  ****  ****  4.27  4.46  ****

                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  61  ****  ****  4.09  4.46  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   13  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.26  4.59  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     13  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  50  ****  ****  4.44  4.64  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      13  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.36  4.84  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    13  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.34  4.64  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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