Course Section: CMPE 212 0101 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ Enrollment: 20

Ouestionnaires: 17

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	

Page 356

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 8 4.06 1138/1669 4.22 4.21 4.23 4.34 4.06 1 0 0 7 7 2 3.69 1372/1666 3.58 3.75 4.19 4.29 3.69 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 3 3 4 6 3.81 1112/1421 3.61 3.76 4.24 4.35 3.81 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 8 2 2 2 1 1 2.63 1583/1617 2.72 3.54 4.15 4.24 2.63 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 1 4 1 0 2.71 1497/1555 3.68 3.87 4.00 3.96 2.71 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 10 0 3 2 1 0 2.67 1497/1543 2.92 3.46 4.06 4.10 2.67 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 5 8 1 3.50 1393/1647 2.90 3.54 4.12 4.19 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.89 4.67 4.59 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 6 4 1 3.55 1339/1605 3.18 3.78 4.07 4.15 3.55 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 Ω 0 6 7 4 3.88 1277/1514 3.71 4.03 4.39 4.39 3.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 6 10 4.53 1176/1551 4.02 4.45 4.66 4.72 4.53 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 7 5 1 3.18 1405/1503 2.79 3.60 4.24 4.29 3.18 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 5 6 6 4.06 1047/1506 3.68 3.82 4.26 4.33 4.06 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 3 1 6 4 3.79 774/1311 3.07 3.50 3.85 3.96 3.79 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 5 4.45 501/1490 3.58 3.96 4.05 4.11 4.45 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 1 1 1 6 2 3.64 1266/1502 2.94 3.32 4.26 4.31 3.64 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 2. 1 0 4 4 3.64 1230/1489 3.27 3.43 4.29 4.36 3.64 6 7 0 2 0 2 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/1006 \*\*\*\* 4.35 4.00 3.99 \*\*\*\* 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 4 4.44 92/ 226 4.11 4.17 4.20 4.42 4.44 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0 0 Ω 2 4 3 4.11 137/ 233 2.90 3.25 4.19 4.36 4.11 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0 1 6 2 4.11 177/ 225 4.03 3.98 4.50 4.74 4.11 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 1 2 6 4.56 103/223 4.61 4.13 4.35 4.71 4.56 8 0 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 2 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 101/206 4.39 4.13 4.15 4.59 4.29

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	=			
					1						

Course Section: CMPE 212 0102 University of Maryland Title

PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN Baltimore County Fall 2006 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 357

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	889/1669	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.27
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	2	5	2		1452/1666	3.58	3.75	4.19	4.29	3.55
		uestions reflec			0	0	1	1	3	3	3		1208/1421	3.61	3.76	4.24	4.35	3.55
		uations reflect			0	7	1	1	1	0	1		1575/1617	2.72	3.54	4.15	4.24	2.75
				what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	773/1555	3.68	3.87	4.13	3.96	4.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	2	0		1410/1543	2.92	3.46	4.06	4.10	3.00
		g system clearl		_	0	1	3	0	5	1	1		1564/1647	2.92	3.54	4.12	4.19	2.70
	-	was class cand		Inea	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.59	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	0	0	1	3	5	1			1538/1605		3.78		4.15	2.82
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	.ii teaci	iing effectiveness	U	U	1	3	5	Т	Τ	2.02	1536/1605	3.10	3.70	4.07	4.15	2.02
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well 1	prepared	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1381/1514	3.71	4.03	4.39	4.39	3.55
		ctor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1160/1551	4.02	4.45	4.66	4.72	3.77
				xplained clearly	1	0	2	3	4	1	0	2.40	1477/1503	2.79	3.60	4.24	4.29	2.40
		es contribute t			1	0	1	2	2	3	2		1368/1506		3.82	4.26	4.33	3.30
				our understanding	1	2	1	0	2	2			791/1311			3.85	3.96	2.71
J. 214 44.	a10115441	r ccommingaco cm	1101100 7	our undersounding	_	_	_	Ü	_	_		3.73	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	3.07	3.30	3.03	3.70	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1251/1490	3.58	3.96	4.05	4.11	3.29
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	4	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1458/1502	2.94	3.32	4.26	4.31	2.71
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	4	0	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1384/1489	3.27	3.43	4.29	4.36	3.14
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.35	4.00	3.99	****
		T alaassa																
1 Did +b.	a lah ina	Labora crease understa	-	f the meterial	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	140/ 226	4.11	4.17	4.20	4.42	4.00
						0	4	0	1	2	1		- ,			4.19		
				ground information	3							2.50	227/ 233	2.90	3.25		4.36	2.50
	_			or lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	1		4.00	187/ 225	4.03	3.98	4.50	4.74	4.00
		structor provid			3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	93/ 223	4.61	4.13	4.35	4.71	4.63
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	89/ 206	4.39	4.13	4.15	4.59	4.43
		Semina	r															
2. Was the	e instruc			ividual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	***	****	4.36	4.60	****
				_														
				Frequ	ency	שוst	rıbı	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00 07		0.00.000	0															1.0
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		кес	auire	ea I	or Ma	ıjor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		~		,				0	1	, ,	-			-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	iera.	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	.0						
				? 1														

Course Section: CMPE 212 0102 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN

Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

2

F

P

I

0

0

1

Page 358 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Ev	valuation Questionnaire
-------------------	-------------------------

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	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	2	1	7	4.27	889/1669	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.34	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1452/1666	3.58	3.75	4.19	4.29	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1208/1421	3.61	3.76	4.24	4.35	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1575/1617	2.72	3.54	4.15	4.24	2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	773/1555	3.68	3.87	4.00	3.96	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.92	3.46	4.06	4.10	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	5	1	1		1564/1647	2.90	3.54	4.12	4.19	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11		1/1668	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1605	3.18	3.78	4.07	4.15	2.82
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1551	4.02	4.45	4.66	4.72	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1506	3.68	3.82	4.26	4.33	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1285/1311	3.07	3.50	3.85	3.96	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1251/1490	3.58	3.96	4.05	4.11	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	2	2	0		1458/1502	2.94	3.32	4.26	4.31	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	4	1	1		1384/1489	3.27	3.43	4.29	4.36	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.35	4.00	3.99	****
- 1														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	4.00	140/ 226	4.11	4 17	4 00	4.42	4 00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	4	0	1	2	3 1		140/ 226 227/ 233	2.90	4.17	4.20 4.19	4.42	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	187/ 225	4.03	3.98	4.50	4.74	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	93/ 223	4.61	4.13	4.35	4.71	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	89/ 206	4.39	4.13	4.15	4.59	4.43
or note requirements for rub reports oreary specified	J	_	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	J	11.15	03, 200	1.00	1113	1.15	1.55	1.15
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
				_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	10
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1		<b>a</b>		1				0	Timelan		1	Mari		1
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 3 D 0		Ger	nera!	L				0	Under-g	rad I	.1	Non-	major	1
5.00 5.15 5 D														

Electives

Other

0

10

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course Section: CMPE 212 0102 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 359

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. D) Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 1

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		Genera	_		0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4 07	000/166		4 01	4 22	1 21	4 07
		ew insights,ski ctor make clear			0	0	1	1	2	1 5	2	4.27	889/1669 1452/1666		4.21	4.23	4.34	4.27 3.55
		estions reflec			0	0	1	1	3	3	_		1208/1421		3.76	4.24	4.35	3.55
		ations reflect			0	7	1	1	1	0	1		1575/1617		3.54	4.15	4.24	2.75
				what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	1		773/155		3.87	4.00	3.96	4.00
				o what you learned	0	4	1	0	4	2	_		1410/1543		3.46	4.06	4.10	3.00
		g system clearl		-	0	1	3	0	5	1	1		1564/164		3.54	4.12	4.19	2.70
		was class canc		11100	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668		4.89	4.67	4.59	5.00
		Lectur	_															
2 Did +h	e instru	tor seem inter	_	n the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	Λ	3 00	****/1553	4.02	4.45	4.66	4.72	3.77
				our understanding	9	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/1311				3.96	
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	ceemiiques en	nance y	our underscanding		O	2	Ü	Ü	Ü	O	1.00	/ 1311	3.07	3.30	3.03	3.50	2.71
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	2	1		1251/1490		3.96	4.05	4.11	3.29
				d to participate	4	0	1	2	2	2	0		1458/1502		3.32	4.26	4.31	2.71
		_		d open discussion	4	0	1	0	4	1	1		1384/1489		3.43	4.29	4.36	3.14
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		4	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	4.35	4.00	3.99	***
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding o	f the material	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	140/ 226	4.11	4.17	4.20	4.42	4.00
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	3	0	4	0	1	2	1	2.50	227/ 233	2.90	3.25	4.19	4.36	2.50
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	187/ 225	4.03	3.98	4.50	4.74	4.00
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	93/ 223	4.61	4.13	4.35	4.71	4.63
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	89/ 206	4.39	4.13	4.15	4.59	4.43
		Semina	r															
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available	for ind	ividual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	7 ****	****	4.36	4.60	****
				Frequ	ency	r Dist	trib	ution	n									
				_	-													
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			T <u>y</u>	<i>r</i> pe 			Majors	S 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-	grad 1	.1	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		_						_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0		Means t				gh
				P 0 T 0		01					-	0	respons	ses to b	e sign	ııııcan	l L	
				I 0		Uti	ner				1	.0						

Course Section: CMPE 306 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO CIRCUIT THEORY

Baltimore County

Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 360

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	8	4	4.23	938/1669	4.23	4.21	4.23	4.28	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	3		993/1666		3.75	4.19	4.20	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	943/1421	4.08	3.76	4.24	4.25	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	4	0		1435/1617	3.38	3.54	4.15	4.22	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	715/1555		3.87	4.00	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	3	1		1294/1543		3.46	4.06	4.14	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	6		1007/1647		3.54	4.12	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668		4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	3	0		1441/1605	3.30	3.78	4.07	4.09	
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1180/1514	4.08	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	862/1551	4.77	4.45	4.66	4.70	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	7	3	3.85	1193/1503	3.85	3.60	4.24	4.28	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	9	1	3.62	1296/1506	3.62	3.82	4.26	4.30	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	1106/1311	3.08	3.50	3.85	3.97	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1490	****	3.96	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	1	1		1395/1502	3.00	3.32	4.26	4.28	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1489	****	3.43	4.29	4.35	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	137/ 226		4.17	4.20	4.17	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	167/ 233	3.90	3.25	4.19	4.13	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	165/ 225	4.20	3.98	4.50	4.45	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	182/ 223	3.90	4.13	4.35	4.27	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	138/ 206	3.90	4.13	4.15	4.08	3.90

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course Section: CMPE 310 0101 University of Maryland Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

PATEL, CHINTAN

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 361

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

0

2

								_	ncies	5			tructor		_	UMBC		Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	647/1669	4.49	4.21	4.23	4.28	4.46
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1206/1666	4.14	3.75	4.19	4.20	3.92
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	1185/1421	4.04	3.76	4.24	4.25	3.62
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	2	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	750/1617	4.60	3.54	4.15	4.22	4.30
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1192/1555	4.19	3.87	4.00	4.03	3.57
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	6	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1336/1543	3.98	3.46	4.06	4.14	3.29
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ained	1	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	997/1647	4.36	3.54	4.12	4.14	4.09
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1039/1668	4.90	4.89	4.67	4.68	4.69
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	857/1605	4.70	3.78	4.07	4.09	4.09
		Lecture	_															
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514		4.03	4.39	4.46	4.85
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551		4.45	4.66	4.70	5.00
		_		explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	3	6		1066/1503		3.60	4.24	4.28	4.00
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	693/1506		3.82	4.26	4.30	4.46
5. Did au	ıdiovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	552/1311	4.37	3.50	3.85	3.97	4.08
		Discus																
				what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1242/1490	4.43	3.96	4.05	4.11	3.30
				ed to participate	3	0	0	1	6	1	2		1338/1502		3.32	4.26	4.28	3.40
				nd open discussion	3	0	1	1	4	3	1		1371/1489		3.43	4.29	4.35	3.20
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		3	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	5.00	4.35	4.00	4.10	****
		Labora	-															
		rease understa			7	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	102/ 226	4.58	4.17	4.20	4.17	4.40
				ground information	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	193/ 233		3.25	4.19	4.13	3.67
	_			for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	102/ 225		3.98	4.50	4.45	4.67
		structor provid			7	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	151/ 223		4.13	4.35	4.27	4.20
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	7	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	110/ 206	4.50	4.13	4.15	4.08	4.17
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 2		Red	 ຫນ <b>່</b> ກ	ed f	or Ma			0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		2.00	-1 ~ -1 .		10		-	-	or adda c	-	-		-	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-			-		5	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
				Р 0									respons				_	
				т О		O+1	h 0 m				1	1						

Other

11

Course Section: CMPE 310 0102 University of Maryland Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Baltimore County

Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN (Instr. A) Fall 2006 4

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 362

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Questions		Mea
Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 590/1669 4.49 4.21 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 11 12 5.00 5.00 4.39 4.51 4.25 881/1666 4.14 3.75 4.15   10 10 10 10 11 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 12 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 12 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 12 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 1 1 1 1		
Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 590/1669 4.49 4.21 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 11 12 5.00 5.00 4.39 4.51 4.25 881/1666 4.14 3.75 4.15   10 10 10 10 11 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 12 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 12 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 12 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 12 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2   10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1 1 1 1 1		
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 881/1666 4.14 3.75 4.1 0id the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.55 814/1421 4.04 3.76 4.2 0id other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 219/1617 4.60 3.54 4.1 0id assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 219/1617 4.60 3.54 4.1 0id assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 580/1543 3.98 3.46 4.0 was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 0ow many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 0ow many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	s from this course 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 590/1669 4.49 4.21 4.23 4.28	4.5
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 2 4.25 814/1421 4.04 3.76 4.2 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 340/1555 4.19 3.87 4.0 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 1 4.50 340/1555 4.19 3.87 4.0 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 580/1543 3.98 3.46 4.0 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1668 4.90 4.89 4.6 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1668 4.90 4.89 4.6 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0 Lecture  Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 441/1514 4.80 4.03 4.3 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.88 3.60 4.2 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/233 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/11		4.2
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 219/1617 4.60 3.54 4.1 2014 assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 340/1555 4.19 3.87 4.0 2014 written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 580/1543 3.98 3.46 4.0 2014 written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 2014 assigned the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 2014 assigned the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0 2014 assigned the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0 2014 assigned the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 441/1514 4.80 4.03 4.3 2014 and instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 2014 and instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 1235/1503 3.88 3.60 4.2 2014 and instructor seem interested and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 1 3.75 1235/1503 3.88 3.60 4.2 2014 and instructor seem interested and explained 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 0 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 2014 and instructor seem and the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 2014 and instructor seem and the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		4.2
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 340/1555 4.19 3.87 4.0 old written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 580/1543 3.98 3.46 4.0 own any times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 down any times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1668 4.90 4.89 4.6 down would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0 old the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 441/1514 4.80 4.03 4.3 old the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 was lecture scontribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 old audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 loid class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 loid class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 loid the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 loid the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 lowers special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 lowers you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 lowers you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 loid the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 loid the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 loid the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.13 4.3 lower enquirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.13 4.3 lower enquirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.13 4.3 lower enquirements for lab		4.7
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 580/1543 3.98 3.46 4.0 was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 6.0 many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0 Eacture  Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 441/1514 4.80 4.03 4.3 bid the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 was lecture scontribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 bid addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 bid class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 bid the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 bid the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.29 4.1 bid the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	•	4.5
Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.1 dow many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1668 4.90 4.89 4.6 dow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0    Lecture	•	4.
How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1668 4.90 4.89 4.6 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.0   Lecture	·	4.
Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lab increase understanding of the material Did the lab instructor encourage dair and open discussion Laboratory Did the lab instructor provide assistance Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.00  2 1 3 4.75 441/1514 4.80 4.03 4.3  4 2.0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6  8 4.0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6  8 4.0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6  8 4.0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2  9 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2  9 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0  9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0  9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0  9 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-	5.0
Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 441/1514 4.80 4.03 4.3 bid the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 1235/1503 3.88 3.60 4.2 bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 bid addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 bid class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 bid the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3		5.
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 441/1514 4.80 4.03 4.3 old the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.6 was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 1235/1503 3.88 3.60 4.2 old the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 old audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8    Discussion old class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1605 4.70 5.76 4.07 4.09	5.1
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 1193/1551 4.75 4.45 4.68 As lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 1235/1503 3.88 3.60 4.2 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/ 233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.3 4.1 4.1 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.3		
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 1235/1503 3.88 3.60 4.2 Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	• •	4.
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.2 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 189/1311 4.37 3.50 3.8 Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/ 233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/ 225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.3		4.
Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0  Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1  Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3		3.
Discussion Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.0 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0  Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/ 233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/ 225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 206 4.50 4.13 4.1  Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.3	what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 1069/1506 4.23 3.82 4.26 4.30	4.
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.00 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.20 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.20 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.00    Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.20 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/ 233 3.67 3.25 4.10 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/ 225 4.67 3.98 4.50 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.31 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 206 4.50 4.13 4.11 Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.31	nce your understanding $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4.
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.00 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.20 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.20 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.00    Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.20 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/ 233 3.67 3.25 4.10 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/ 225 4.67 3.98 4.50 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.31 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 206 4.50 4.13 4.11 Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.31	າກ	
Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.2 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0 Laboratory  Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3		5.
Laboratory Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.2 Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.0  Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1  Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	· ·	3.
Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1  Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3		3.
Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/ 233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/ 225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.3	<u>.</u>	5.
Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.2 Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/ 233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/ 225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 112 5.00 5.00 4.3		
Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.1 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	•	4.0
Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/225 4.67 3.98 4.5 Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Evere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	- <del>-</del>	3.
Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 85/223 4.51 4.13 4.3 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.1 Seminar  Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	•	4.
Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified $1\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 2\ 4.67\ 56/\ 206\ 4.50\ 4.13\ 4.1$ Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $3\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 0\ 1\ 5.00\ 1/\ 112\ 5.00\ 5.00\ 4.3$		4.
Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $egin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		
Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $$ 3 $$ 0 $$ 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.3	cs clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/206 4.50 4.13 4.15 4.08	4.
Frequency Distribution	the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/112 5.00 5.00 4.38 4.53	5.0
	Frequency Distribution	
dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type	Expected Grades Reasons Type Major	3
-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Ma	Demined for Mainer 0 Gurdunts 0 William	
-27		•
-83	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		~h
	' P O Ploatizoa O #### Moona thoma and not once	71T
I 0 Other 4	P 0 responses to be significant	

Course Section: CMPE 310 0102 University of Maryland
Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG Baltimore County

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 4
Ouestionnaires: 4

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 363

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 590/1669 4.49 4.21 4.23 4.28 4.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 881/1666 4.14 3.75 4.19 4.20 4.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 814/1421 4.04 3.76 4.24 4.25 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 219/1617 4.60 3.54 4.15 4.22 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 1 1 4.50 340/1555 4.19 3.87 4.00 4.03 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 580/1543 3.98 3.46 4.06 4.14 4.33 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
9. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 481/1647 4.36 3.54 4.12 4.14 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1/1668 4.90 4.89 4.67 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  $\phantom{0}$  3  $\phantom{0}$  0  $\phantom{0}$  0  $\phantom{0}$  1 5.00 1/1605 4.70 3.78 4.07 4.09 5.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1490 4.43 3.96 4.05 4.11 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 2 0 1 3.67 1253/1502 3.58 3.32 4.26 4.28 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1398/1489 3.07 3.43 4.29 4.35 3.00 4. Were special techniques successful 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1006 5.00 4.35 4.00 4.10 5.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 56/ 226 4.58 4.17 4.20 4.17 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 1 0 0 0 2 3.67 193/233 3.67 3.25 4.19 4.13 3.67 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 102/ 225 4.67 3.98 4.50 4.45 4.67 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 4.67$ 85/ 223 4.51 4.13 4.35 4.27 4.67 56/ 206 4.50 4.13 4.15 4.08 4.67 Seminar

#### Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CMPE 314 0101 Title

University of Maryland PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR Baltimore County

Instructor: YAN, LI Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2006

Page 364 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Quanti an a	MD	27.7	Fre	equer	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	 			- <del>4</del> 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.21	4.23	4.28	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	1028/1666	4.12	3.75	4.19	4.20	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	764/1421	4.31	3.76	4.24	4.25	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	975/1617	4.09	3.54	4.15	4.22	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	676/1555	4.13	3.87	4.00	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.46	4.06	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	., 17	4.18	940/1647	4.18 5.00	3.54	4.12	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 2	0	1	0	2	4	1 /	4.20	1/1668	4.20	4.89 3.78	4.67 4.07	4.68 4.09	5.00 4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching ellectiveness	2	U	1	U	2	4	8	4.20	759/1605	4.20	3.78	4.07	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	908/1514	4.44	4.03	4.39	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.45	4.66	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	1035/1503	4.06	3.60	4.24	4.28	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	8	6	4.13	1010/1506	4.13	3.82	4.26	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	868/1311	3.64	3.50	3.85	3.97	3.64
Discussion				_			_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	Τ	0	0	1		****/1490	***	3.96	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15 15	0	0	0	1 1	0 1	Ţ		****/1502 ****/1489	****	3.32	4.26 4.29	4.28	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	15 15	1	1	0	U	U T	0		****/1006	****	4.35	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	Τ	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	/1006		4.33	4.00	4.10	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	2	6	6	1	3.25	205/ 226	3.25	4.17	4.20	4.17	3.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	3	3	5	5	0	2.75	226/ 233	2.75	3.25	4.19	4.13	2.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	9	5	0	1	0	1.53	225/ 225	1.53	3.98	4.50	4.45	1.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	13	1	2	0	0	1.31	223/ 223	1.31	4.13	4.35	4.27	1.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	7	2	5	1	1	2.19	204/ 206	2.19	4.13	4.15	4.08	2.19
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	5	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-		_	
				2	0						

Course Section: CMPE 323 0101 University of Maryland Title SIGNAL/SYSTEMS THEORY Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 365

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 3 11 4.67 389/1669 4.67 4.21 4.23 4.28 4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 4 7 4.20 957/1666 4.20 3.75 4.19 4.20 4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 5 7 4.20 863/1421 4.20 3.76 4.24 4.25 4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 0 0 4 2 5 4.09 975/1617 4.09 3.54 4.15 4.22 4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 2 7 4 4.15 655/1555 4.15 3.87 4.00 4.03 4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 4 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 390/1543 4.50 3.46 4.06 4.14 4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 2 6 5 4.00 1043/1647 4.00 3.54 4.12 4.14 4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 13 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.89 4.67 4.68 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 591/1605 4.33 3.78 4.07 4.09 4.33
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 151/1514 4.93 4.03 4.39 4.46 4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 650/1551 4.86 4.45 4.66 4.70 4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 491/1503 4.57 3.60 4.24 4.28 4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 496/1506 4.64 3.82 4.26 4.30 4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 2 3 9 4.27 439/1311 4.27 3.50 3.85 3.97 4.27
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1490 **** 3.96 4.05 4.11 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/1502 **** 3.32 4.26 4.28 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1489 **** 3.43 4.29 4.35 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	Λ						

Course Section: CMPE 415 0101 Title

PROGRAM LOGIC DEVICES

Instructor: POURRAD, REZA M

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 366 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	1															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls from this o	course	1	0	6	3	2	4	2	2.59	1638/1669	2.59	4.21	4.23	4.39	2.59
		ctor make clear			0	0	10	1	3	3	1	2.11	1658/1666	2.11	3.75	4.19	4.22	2.11
		uestions reflect			0	0	6	5	3	2	2	2.39	1413/1421	2.39	3.76	4.24	4.38	2.39
		ations reflect		-	0	5	7	0	3	2	1		1607/1617	2.23	3.54	4.15	4.22	2.23
	_	eadings contrib	-		0	9	3	2	2	2	0		1539/1555	2.33	3.87	4.00	4.08	2.33
		signments contr	-	you learned	0	5	4	3	4	1	1		1523/1543	2.38	3.46	4.06	4.18	2.38
		g system clearly			0	0	8	2	3	4	1		1600/1647	2.33	3.54	4.12	4.14	2.33
		was class cance		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How woul	ld you g	grade the overa	ll teaching eff	fectiveness	2	0	6	5	3	2	0	2.06	1583/1605	2.06	3.78	4.07	4.16	2.06
		Lecture	е															
		actor's lectures			0	0	6	4	3	2	3	2.56	1485/1514	2.56	4.03	4.39	4.45	2.56
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in the su	ıbject	0	0	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	1470/1551	3.72	4.45	4.66	4.73	3.72
3. Was lect	ure mat	erial presented	d and explained	d clearly	0	0	4	5	5	2	2	2.61	1462/1503	2.61	3.60	4.24	4.27	2.61
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute to	o what you lear	rned	1	0	5	5	3	1	3	2.53	1455/1506	2.53	3.82	4.26	4.29	2.53
5. Did audi	lovisual	l techniques enl	nance your unde	erstanding	0	6	4	3	3	1	1	2.33	1253/1311	2.33	3.50	3.85	3.88	2.33
		Discus	sion															
l. Did clas	ss discu	ussions contrib	ute to what you	ı learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1490	****	3.96	4.05	4.26	****
		nts actively end			16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1502	****	3.32	4.26	4.46	* * * *
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and open o	discussion	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1489	****	3.43	4.29	4.52	****
4. Were spe	ecial te	echniques succes	ssful		16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1006	****	4.35	4.00	4.21	****
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	lab inc	crease understa		aterial	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.17	4.20	4.61	***
		ded with adequat			17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.25	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were nec	cessary	materials avail	lable for lab a	activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.98	4.50	4.39	****
1. Did the	lab ins	structor provide	e assistance		17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.13	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were req	quiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clearly sp	pecified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.13	4.15	4.20	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	ı									
Credits Ear	mad	Cum. GPA	Ermo	cted Grades				Do					т.				Majawa	
Ear		Cuiii. GPA	ес						asons				Ту.	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 7			Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99		3 1				,				2	1	, ,	0			0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5 (			Ge	nera	T				3	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	0
	10	3.00-3.49	5 I									0			1			1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 I			EI	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	n
			I			٥.	1				-	4	respons	es to b	e sign	niticar	ıt	
			]			Ot	her				1	4						
			1	? 8														

Course Section: CMPE 419 0101

Title COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 367 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.21	4.23	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1288/1666	3.83	3.75	4.19	4.22	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	939/1421	4.08	3.76	4.24	4.38	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	958/1617	4.11	3.54	4.15	4.22	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	533/1555	4.29	3.87	4.00	4.08	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1195/1543	3.67	3.46	4.06	4.18	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	4	2	2	3.00	1526/1647	3.00	3.54	4.12	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	0	5	2	3.50	1357/1605	3.50	3.78	4.07	4.16	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	6	1	2 /2	1405/1514	2 /2	4.03	4.39	4.45	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9		1028/1551	4.67	4.45	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	5	2		1362/1503		3.60	4.24	4.73	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	6	3		1277/1506	3.42	3.82	4.24	4.29	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	3			812/1311			3.85	3.88	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	Τ	U	Τ	3	۷	3./1	812/1311	3./1	3.50	3.85	3.88	3./1
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.96	4.05	4.26	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1160/1502	3.83	3.32	4.26	4.46	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	3.43	4.29	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.35	4.00	4.21	4.00
Tabanakann														
Laboratory	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	++++/ 226	****	1 17	4 20	1 (1	++++
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9		0	0	0	2	0		****/ 226	****	4.17	4.20	4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 233	****	3.25	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 225		3.98	4.50	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 223	****	4.13	4.35	4.56	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	U	U	0	0	2	U	4.00	****/ 206	***	4.13	4.15	4.20	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
Field Work														
	_	0	1	0	0	_	0	2 00	E1 / E0	2 00	2 00	4 00	2 04	3.00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	-	2	0	3.00	51/ 58	3.00	3.00	4.22	3.94	3.00 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 52		****	4.06	3.80	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	***		4.39	3.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	***

Course Section: CMPE 419 0101

Title COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 367 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2 Ma	ajor	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad 1	LO No	on-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here are r	not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	oe signific	ant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: CMPE 646 0101 Title

University of Maryland VLSI DESIGN VERIFICATI Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 368 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights, skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1001/1	669	4.18	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.18
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	1	0	3	5			1409/1				4.19	4.19	3.64
		estions reflect	_	_	1	0	1	3	1	2			1298/1					4.33	3.30
		ations reflect			0	1	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1425/1	617	3.40	3.54	4.15	4.24	3.40
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	773/1	.555	4.00	3.87	4.00	4.07	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	2			1314/1				4.06	4.27	3.36
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	explai	ined	0	0	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1290/1	647	3.73	3.54	4.12	4.15	3.73
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1594/1	668	3.91	4.89	4.67	4.83	3.91
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1210/1	605	3.75	3.78	4.07	4.13	3.75
		Lecture	2																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1303/1	514	3.82	4.03	4.39	4.37	3.82
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.91					4.66		
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9			941/1			3.60			
		s contribute to			0	0	0	1		4			1219/1					4.24	
				our understanding	0	0	1	1	2	5			919/1						
		Discuss																	
ו הלא מו				what you learned	_	0	0	0	2	2	2	4 00	849/1	400	4 00	3.96	4.05	1 10	4.00
				d to participate	5 5	0	0	0	2	3			1160/1			3.32		4.18 4.46	
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	5 5			973/1						
		chniques succes		d open discussion	5 5	1	1	0	1	2			810/1			3.43 4.35		4.44	
. were s	рестат се	cimiques succes	SSLUI		5	Τ	1	U	Τ	2	1	3.40	810/1	000	3.40	4.35	4.00	4.11	3.40
		Laborat	cory																
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequat	e backs	ground information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	233	***	3.25	4.19	4.41	***
		Field W	Jork																
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribut	te to wh	nat you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	58	****	3.00	4.22	4.53	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1										
O 1		G GDA		Book and a Consider				D										M	
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; · – – – -				Тур	e 			Majors	; 
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 6		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Grad	luate	9	4	Majo	r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	neral	L				0	Unde	er-gi	rad	7	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0												_			_
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0			Means t			_	ſh
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	0							
				? 1															