

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101
 Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 384
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	2	7	4.50	615/1639	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1326/1639	3.15	4.00	4.22	4.27	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	935/1397	3.55	4.05	4.28	4.39	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1506/1583	3.58	3.95	4.19	4.28	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	655/1532	4.58	3.90	4.01	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1415/1504	3.00	3.74	4.05	4.09	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	4	0	2	3.11	1508/1612	2.06	3.26	4.16	4.21	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1318/1579	2.75	3.87	4.08	4.14	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1237/1518	3.75	4.41	4.43	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	802/1520	4.65	4.81	4.70	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	1	2	3.40	1384/1517	3.20	4.05	4.27	4.34	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1161/1550	3.20	4.03	4.22	4.33	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	871/1295	3.70	3.95	3.94	4.07	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1183/1398	4.17	4.19	4.07	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	887/1391	3.58	4.10	4.30	4.35	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1065/1388	4.42	4.58	4.28	4.37	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	129/ 224	4.00	4.25	4.10	4.33	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	203/ 240	3.53	4.12	4.11	4.47	3.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	201/ 219	3.39	4.25	4.44	4.61	3.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	150/ 215	3.81	4.27	4.35	4.43	4.11	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	152/ 198	4.43	4.54	4.18	4.08	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0102
 Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 385
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	3.50	1497/1639	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1628/1639	3.15	4.00	4.22	4.27	2.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1363/1397	3.55	4.05	4.28	4.39	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	3.58	3.95	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	4.58	3.90	4.01	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	2.06	3.26	4.16	4.21	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1574/1579	2.75	3.87	4.08	4.14	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1419/1518	3.75	4.41	4.43	4.48	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1188/1520	4.65	4.81	4.70	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.20	4.05	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1491/1550	3.20	4.03	4.22	4.33	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	4.17	4.19	4.07	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.58	4.10	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	4.42	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	129/ 224	4.00	4.25	4.10	4.33	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	206/ 240	3.53	4.12	4.11	4.47	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	213/ 219	3.39	4.25	4.44	4.61	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	196/ 215	3.81	4.27	4.35	4.43	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	4.43	4.54	4.18	4.08	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 306 0101
 Title INTRO CIRCUIT THEORY
 Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 386
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	1	6	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1238/1397	3.63	4.05	4.28	4.26	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1205/1583	3.83	3.95	4.19	4.24	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.90	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1249/1504	3.43	3.74	4.05	4.12	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	3.26	4.16	4.12	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1453/1579	3.14	3.87	4.08	4.07	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1189/1518	4.13	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1347/1517	3.50	4.05	4.27	4.23	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	1	2	3.38	1375/1550	3.38	4.03	4.22	4.20	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.95	3.94	3.95	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	99/ 224	4.25	4.25	4.10	4.06	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	187/ 240	3.75	4.12	4.11	4.08	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	161/ 219	4.25	4.25	4.44	4.44	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	96/ 215	4.50	4.27	4.35	4.21	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	79/ 198	4.38	4.54	4.18	4.04	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

Graduate 0 Major 8 Under-grad 9 Non-major 1 ##### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Other 8					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	7	5	4.14	1016/1639	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1090/1639	4.50	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	897/1397	4.57	4.05	4.28	4.26	4.14		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	939/1583	4.55	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1168/1532	4.31	3.90	4.01	4.05	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	667/1504	4.10	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1263/1612	3.89	3.26	4.16	4.12	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	889/1579	4.50	3.87	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	397/1518	4.89	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	674/1520	4.93	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1042/1517	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	991/1550	4.57	4.03	4.22	4.20	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	474/1295	4.62	3.95	3.94	3.95	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1106/1398	4.25	4.19	4.07	4.13	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1192/1391	4.30	4.10	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1130/1388	4.33	4.58	4.28	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	610/ 958	4.38	4.38	3.93	3.97	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	51/ 224	4.75	4.25	4.10	4.06	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	108/ 240	4.69	4.12	4.11	4.08	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	43/ 219	4.93	4.25	4.44	4.44	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	184/ 215	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.21	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	79/ 198	4.69	4.54	4.18	4.04	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0102
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 388
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1/1639	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.50	4.00	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.57	4.05	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	4.55	3.95	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	4.31	3.90	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	4.10	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	3.89	3.26	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.50	3.87	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	4.89	4.41	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.93	4.81	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.57	4.03	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	4.62	3.95	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	4.25	4.19	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	4.30	4.10	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	4.33	4.58	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	4.38	4.38	3.93	3.97	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	4.75	4.25	4.10	4.06	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	4.69	4.12	4.11	4.08	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 219	4.93	4.25	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.21	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	4.69	4.54	4.18	4.04	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.50	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.59	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.60	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.65	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 82	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.78	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.63	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.52	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	5.00	

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0102
 Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 388
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 314 0101
 Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 389
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	15	4.61	495/1639	4.61	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	709/1639	4.39	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	859/1397	4.19	4.05	4.28	4.26	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	900/1583	4.14	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	562/1532	4.28	3.90	4.01	4.05	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	786/1504	4.07	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1399/1612	3.50	3.26	4.16	4.12	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	527/1579	4.38	3.87	4.08	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	242/1518	4.89	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.03	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	451/1295	4.27	3.95	3.94	3.95	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	180/ 224	3.73	4.25	4.10	4.06	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	75/ 240	4.55	4.12	4.11	4.08	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	97/ 219	4.64	4.25	4.44	4.44	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	80/ 215	4.64	4.27	4.35	4.21	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	42/ 198	4.64	4.54	4.18	4.04	4.64	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMPE 314 0101
 Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 389
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 323 0101
 Title SIGNAL/SYSTEMS THEORY
 Instructor: RUTLEDGE, JANET
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 390
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	14	4.35	806/1639	4.35	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	496/1639	4.52	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	574/1397	4.46	4.05	4.28	4.26	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	2	3	4	11	4.05	981/1583	4.05	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	2	2	2	10	3.60	1184/1532	3.60	3.90	4.01	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	678/1504	4.19	3.74	4.05	4.12	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	10	12	4.32	731/1612	4.32	3.26	4.16	4.12	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	691/1635	4.88	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.87	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	301/1518	4.85	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	802/1520	4.81	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	14	4.36	768/1517	4.36	4.05	4.27	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	10	11	4.16	972/1550	4.16	4.03	4.22	4.20	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	413/1295	4.32	3.95	3.94	3.95	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.12	4.11	4.08	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.27	4.35	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CMPE 323 0101
 Title SIGNAL/SYSTEMS THEORY
 Instructor: RUTLEDGE, JANET
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 390
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	26	Non-major	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 415 0101
 Title PROGRAM LOGIC DEVICES
 Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 391
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	16	4.84	222/1639	4.84	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	800/1639	4.32	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	497/1397	4.53	4.05	4.28	4.38	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	751/1583	4.29	3.95	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1374/1532	3.21	3.90	4.01	4.07	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1010/1504	3.80	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	743/1612	4.32	3.26	4.16	4.18	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1195/1635	4.44	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	646/1579	4.27	3.87	4.08	4.21	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.81	4.70	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	713/1517	4.41	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	920/1550	4.22	4.03	4.22	4.24	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	421/1295	4.31	3.95	3.94	4.01	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.50	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.25	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.12	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.25	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	4.27	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.54	4.18	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMPE 419 0101
 Title COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL
 Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 392
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	3	1	9	3.94	1217/1639	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.42	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	4	5	3.44	1509/1639	3.44	4.00	4.22	4.29	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	4	3	3.13	1349/1397	3.13	4.05	4.28	4.38	3.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	5	1	4	3.29	1477/1583	3.29	3.95	4.19	4.31	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	3.90	4.01	4.07	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	4	3	3	3.23	1347/1504	3.23	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	3	2	4	1	2	2.75	1564/1612	2.75	3.26	4.16	4.18	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	3.87	4.08	4.21	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1351/1518	3.80	4.41	4.43	4.51	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	3	2	4	3.13	1443/1517	3.13	4.05	4.27	4.34	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	1	5	3	3.13	1426/1550	3.13	4.03	4.22	4.24	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	3	2	1	3	2.69	1226/1295	2.69	3.95	3.94	4.01	2.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.19	4.07	4.23	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1106/1391	3.83	4.10	4.30	4.48	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 9
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 2		

Course-Section: CMPE 423 0101
 Title COMMUNICATION ENGNG
 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 393
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.05	4.28	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.67	3.95	4.19	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.90	4.01	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.74	4.05	4.20	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	913/1612	4.17	3.26	4.16	4.18	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	5.00	3.87	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.41	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.03	4.22	4.24	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.95	3.94	4.01	4.00	

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

Course-Section: CMPE 450 0101
 Title CAPSTONE I
 Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 394
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	3	10	7	9	3.42	1523/1639	3.42	4.32	4.27	4.42	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	12	6	4	2.97	1589/1639	2.97	4.00	4.22	4.29	2.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	6	7	2	4	5	2.79	1388/1397	2.79	4.05	4.28	4.38	2.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	5	7	10	6	3.43	1436/1583	3.43	3.95	4.19	4.31	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	7	6	8	5	2	2.61	1491/1532	2.61	3.90	4.01	4.07	2.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	6	12	6	2	3.00	1415/1504	3.00	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	10	8	4	6	1	2.31	1588/1612	2.31	3.26	4.16	4.18	2.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	9	1	1	1	14	3.38	1606/1635	3.38	4.74	4.65	4.72	3.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	6	0	1	4	12	3	3.85	1094/1579	3.85	3.87	4.08	4.21	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	11	8	6	3.57	1408/1518	3.57	4.41	4.43	4.51	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	5	9	4	9	3.54	1489/1520	3.54	4.81	4.70	4.75	3.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	10	7	7	3.57	1321/1517	3.57	4.05	4.27	4.34	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	8	4	7	4	4	2.70	1480/1550	2.70	4.03	4.22	4.24	2.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	10	3	3	5	3	1	2.73	1221/1295	2.73	3.95	3.94	4.01	2.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.50	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.25	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.12	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 219	****	4.25	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.27	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.54	4.18	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30

Course-Section: CMPE 491B 0101
 Title BIOMED ELECTRONICS
 Instructor: KOSTOV, IORDAN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 395
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.57	540/1639	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	831/1639	4.29	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	447/1397	4.57	4.05	4.28	4.38	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.95	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1471/1532	2.80	3.90	4.01	4.07	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1445/1504	2.80	3.74	4.05	4.20	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1497/1612	3.17	3.26	4.16	4.18	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.87	4.08	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.41	4.43	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1550	4.71	4.03	4.22	4.24	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1295	4.80	3.95	3.94	4.01	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 491N 0101
 Title NANO-ELECTRONICS FOR CM
 Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 396
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	3	1	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.00	4.22	4.29	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1151/1397	3.80	4.05	4.28	4.38	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1367/1583	3.60	3.95	4.19	4.31	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1184/1532	3.60	3.90	4.01	4.07	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1010/1504	3.80	3.74	4.05	4.20	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	1572/1612	2.60	3.26	4.16	4.18	2.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1396/1635	4.20	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1364/1579	3.40	3.87	4.08	4.21	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1141/1518	4.20	4.41	4.43	4.51	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1384/1517	3.40	4.05	4.27	4.34	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.03	4.22	4.24	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.95	3.94	4.01	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CMPE 646 0101
 Title VLSI DESIGN VERIFICATI
 Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 397
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.05	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	3.95	4.19	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.90	4.01	4.10	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.67	3.74	4.05	4.29	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1327/1612	3.67	3.26	4.16	4.27	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.87	4.08	4.17	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.41	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.03	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.95	3.94	3.95	4.33	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.19	4.07	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.10	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.49	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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