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

PHATAK, DHANANJ

Instructor:

Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 384

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

Quoboronni				Dougesto Coo		_,	uu -	V-1- Q		01111	<u> </u>	•						
			ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect						
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5				Mean		Mean	
		 Genera	.1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4 50	615/1639	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	2	3		1326/1639		4.00	4.22		3.80
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10			4.05	4.28	4.39	4.10
		uations reflect			0	4	2	0	1	1	2		1506/1583		3.95	4.19	4.28	3.17
				what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	1	3		655/1532		3.90	4.01	4.09	4.17
				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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained -	0	1	0	3	4	0	2	3.11	1508/1612	2.06	3.26	4.16	4.21	3.11
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ill tea	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1318/1579	2.75	3.87	4.08	4.14	3.50
		Lectur																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1237/1518	3.75	4.41	4.43	4.48	4.00	
		ctor seem inter		0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	802/1520	4.65	4.81	4.70	4.78	4.80	
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	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	e lecture	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 au	diovisual	your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	871/1295	3.70	3.95	3.94	4.07	3.70		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1183/1398	4.17	4.19	4.07	4.14	3.33
				ed 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succe	essful		4	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	4.00	****
		Labora	itorv															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding (	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 yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te bac	kground information	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	203/ 240	3.53	4.12	4.11	4.47	3.56
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avai	lable :	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	e lab ins	structor provid	le assi:	stance	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	150/ 215	3.81	4.27	4.35	4.43	4.11
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	1	2	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	152/ 198	4.43	4.54	4.18	4.08	3.86
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arnod	Expected Grades				P.O.	asons				- Ττ	ре			Majors	,		
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra																	, 
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0							1				0	TTm d a		. 0	Mari		0
							nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	LO	Non-	-major	0
84-150 Grad.	1 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	3	D 0 F 1		. וים	ecti					0	#### -	Moana +	horo -	ro not	t onous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	3	P 0		E16	=CLI	veb				U	respons				_	111
			P 0		O+1	0.030					0	respons	CD LU L	JE BIGI	ııııdı	10		

Other

Course-Section: CMPE 212 0102 University of Maryland Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN Baltimore County Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ Fall 2007

84-150

Grad.

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

D

F

Ρ

0

0

I 0

University of Maryland Page 385
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							_	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1497/1639	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.50
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	0	0		1628/1639	3.15	4.00	4.22	4.27	2.50
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1363/1397	3.55	4.05	4.28	4.39	3.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	3.58	3.95	4.19	4.28	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	oute 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	e grading	g system clearl	Ly expla	ained	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	2.06	3.26	4.16	4.21	1.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1574/1579	2.75	3.87	4.08	4.14	2.00
		Lectur	re															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	es 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	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1188/1520	4.65	4.81	4.70	4.78	4.50
3. Was led	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.20	4.05	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did the	2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1491/1550	3.20	4.03	4.22	4.33	2.50
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	oute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively er	ncourage	ed 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	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	4.42	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00
		Labora	atory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	rease understa	anding o	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 yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	ate back	ground information	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	206/ 240	3.53	4.12	4.11	4.47	3.50
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avai	ilable 1	for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	213/ 219	3.39	4.25	4.44	4.61	3.00
		structor provid			0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	196/ 215	3.81	4.27	4.35	4.43	3.50
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab rep	ports c	learly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	4.43	4.54	4.18	4.08	5.00
	Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n												
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re:	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	l.
	Expected Grades									- 								. – – – –
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1																	
56-83								1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0

Electives

Other

0

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

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: MENYUK, CURTIS

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 9

Page 386 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
. 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	4.6
. 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	4.2
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
Lecture														
. 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.
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
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
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
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
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.13	*
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.35	*
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.34	*
Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	3.97	*
Laboratory														
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
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
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
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
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
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3

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	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	0						

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

Baltimore County PATEL, CHINTAN

Enrollment: 15

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 387 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did voi	ı dəin ne	Genera w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4 14	1016/1639	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.14
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	4	5		1090/1639		4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14			4.05	4.28	4.26	4.14
		ations reflect			1	3	0	1	1	4	4		939/1583	4.55	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.14
				hat you learned	0	5 6	0	2	1	3	2		1168/1532		3.90	4.19	4.05	3.63
				what you learned		4	0	0	2	3 4	4	4.20	667/1504	4.10	3.74	4.01	4.12	4.20
		signments contr s system clearl			. 0	0	0	3	2	4	5		1263/1612		3.74	4.16	4.12	3.79
		was class cand		nea	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635		4.74	4.16		5.00
						U T	0	0	3	-	1.3 3		,				4.66	
9. How wou	ıla you g	grade the overa	II teach	ing effectiveness	3	U	U	U	3	5	3	4.00	889/1579	4.50	3.87	4.08	4.07	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	397/1518	4.89	4.41	4.43	4.39	4.79
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	674/1520	4.93	4.81	4.70	4.68	4.86
				olained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	6		1042/1517		4.05	4.27	4.23	4.07
		s contribute t			0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	991/1550		4.03	4.22	4.20	4.14
			_	ur understanding	0	1	0	1	2	3	7		474/1295			3.94		4.23
o. Dia auc	iiovisuai	. techniques en	nance yo	ur understanding	U	1	U	_	4	3	,	4.43	4/4/1293	4.02	3.93	3.94	3.95	4.43
		Discus																
				hat you learned	4	0	1	0	4	3	2		1106/1398		4.19	4.07	4.13	3.50
2. Were al	ll studen	its actively en	couraged	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	e instruc	tor 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 sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		4	6	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	610/ 958	4.38	4.38	3.93	3.97	3.75
		Labora	torv															
1 Did the	lah inc	rease understa	_	the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	51/ 224	4.75	4.25	4.10	4.06	4.50
				round information		0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	108/ 240		4.12	4.11	4.08	4.38
				r lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	43/ 219		4.25	4.44	4.44	
	_	structor provid			6	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	184/ 215					3.88
					•				-		_					4.35		
o. were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	79/ 198	4.69	4.54	4.18	4.04	4.38
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
														- 				
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 2 B 3		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	14
			3			a.	m 0	1				٥	TTm -1	d .	1.4	NT	mo	^
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	-	C 5		Ge:	nera	.1				0	Under-g	rad .	L4	Non-	-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 1														,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 1		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - :				-	gh
				P 0									respons	es to l	oe sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her				Τ	4						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0102

SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Title

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	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
Conomal														
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		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		1/1518		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		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		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		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		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		1/ 224		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		1/ 219		4.25	4.44	4.44	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 215		4.27	4.35	4.21	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	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		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 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.60	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00 4.00	1/ 80 49/ 82	5.00 4.00	5.00 4.00	4.47 4.16	4.65 4.08	5.00 4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	U	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	49/ 02	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.00	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		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	U	U	U	0	U	1	U	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		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 1		1/ 43 1/ 32		5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00
<ol> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> <li>Were there enough proctors for all the students</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32 1/ 21	5.00 5.00	5.00 5.00	4.37 4.52	5.00 5.00	5.00 5.00
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	U	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.34	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

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				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

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		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	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	495/1639		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		4.00	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		4.05	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		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		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		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		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		4.05	4.27	4.23	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5		4.50	638/1550		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		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		****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/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		4.12	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		4.44	4.44	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	80/ 215				4.21	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	42/ 198			4.18	4.04	
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

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 323 0101

Title SIGNAL/SYSTEMS THEORY

RUTLEDGE, JANET

Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 26

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 390 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		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	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			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		****/ 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	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****
4. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 3,		3.00	1.50	1.52	
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: RUTLE

RUTLEDGE, JANET

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 26

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 390 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 415 0101 University of Maryland Title PROGRAM LOGIC DEVICES Baltimore County

PROGRAM LOGIC DEVICES Baltimore County PLUSQUELLIC, JA Fall 2007

0

2

I ?

Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 391 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	222/1639	4.84	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.84
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	800/1639	4.32	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.32
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	497/1397	4.53	4.05	4.28	4.38	4.53
	_	ations reflect			0	2	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	751/1583	4.29	3.95	4.19	4.31	4.29
				what you learned	0	5	1	3	5	2	3		1374/1532		3.90	4.01	4.07	3.21
				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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	743/1612	4.32	3.26	4.16	4.18	4.32
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1195/1635	4.44	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.44
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	646/1579	4.27	3.87	4.08	4.21	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s 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 th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	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 le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl							0	1	8	8	4.41	713/1517	4.41	4.05	4.27	4.34	4.41
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							1	3	5	9	4.22	920/1550	4.22	4.03	4.22	4.24	4.22
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	421/1295	4.31	3.95	3.94	4.01	4.31
		Discus																
				what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.23	****
				ed to participate	17	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.48	****
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.50	****
		Labora	-															
				of the material	17	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 224	****	4.25	4.10	4.49	****
				ground information	17	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 240	****	4.12	4.11	4.26	****
				for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 219	****	4.25	4.44	4.42	****
		structor provid		stance Learly specified	17 17	0	0	0 1	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215 ****/ 198	****	4.27 4.54	4.35	4.28	****
5. Were r	equiremen	ics for lab rep	OILS C.	rearry specified	1/	U	U		U	1	U	3.00	/ 190		4.54	4.10	4.21	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 6	Required for Majors						0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	16	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9	Required for hajorb 0				-		-	-	) ~					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 4					4	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	3		
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0											-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1					ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	

Other

Course-Section: CMPE 419 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 COMP ARTH ALGO, & IMPL

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 16

# Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 392

Job IRBR3029

						1			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
			Question			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera																
1. D	id you	gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	2	3	1	9	3.94	1217/1639	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.42	3.94
2. D	id the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	3	1	3	4	5	3.44	1509/1639	3.44	4.00	4.22	4.29	3.44
3. D	id the	exam qu	estions reflec	t 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. D	id oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	2	1	3	5	1	4	3.29	1477/1583	3.29	3.95	4.19	4.31	3.29
5. D	id ass	igned re	adings contrib	ute 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. D	id wri	tten ass	signments contr	ibute	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. Wa	as the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	4	3	2	4	1	2	2.75	1564/1612	2.75	3.26	4.16	4.18	2.75
8. H	ow man	y times	was class cand	elled		0	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.75
9. H	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectives						1	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	3.87	4.08	4.21	3.71
			Lectur	·e															
1. W	ere th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1351/1518	3.80	4.41	4.43	4.51	3.80
2. D	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Wa	as lec	ture mat	erial presente	d 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. D	id the	lecture	s contribute t	o 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. D	id aud	iovisual	techniques en	hance	your understanding	1	2	4	3	2	1	3	2.69	1226/1295	2.69	3.95	3.94	4.01	2.69
			Discus	sion															
1. D	id cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute 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. W	ere al	1 studen	ıts actively en	courage	ed to participate	10	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1106/1391	3.83	4.10	4.30	4.48	3.83
3. D	id the	instruc	tor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. W	ere sp	ecial te	chniques succe	essful		10	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	****	4.38	3.93	4.24	***
					Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Re:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
creares marined cum. GPA Expected Grades										, 									
00-		2	0.00-0.99	1	A 5	Required for Majors 0				0	Graduat	е	7	Majo	or	16			
28-		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-	83	Ω	2 00-2 99	Ω	C 0		Gei	nera'	1				4	IInder-a	rad	9	Non-	-maior	Ω

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	2						

#### University of Maryland COMMUNICATION ENGNG Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMPE 423 0101 Page 393 Title FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Instructor: PINKSTON, JOHN Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 6

Ouestionnaires:	6	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Juestionnaires.	0	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					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	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	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
Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ut i oi	n									

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Page 394 FEB 13, 2008 Baltimore County Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMPE 450 0101

CAPSTONE I

35

PATEL, CHINTAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 33

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did wou gain ne	General ew 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
	ctor make clear the expe		0	0	4	7	12	6	4		1589/1639		4.00	4.22	4.29	2.97
	uestions reflect the exp		2	7	6	7	2	4	5		1388/1397		4.05	4.28	4.38	2.79
_	uations reflect the expe	-	1	2	2	5	7	10	6		1436/1583			4.19	4.31	3.43
	eadings contribute to wh	_	2	3	7	6	8	5	2		1491/1532		3.90			2.61
_	signments contribute to	-	2	3	2	6	12	6	2		1415/1504			4.05	4.20	3.00
	g system clearly explain	_	2	2	10	8	4	6	1		1588/1612			4.16	4.18	2.31
	was class cancelled		7	0	9	1	1	1	14	3.38	1606/1635			4.65	4.72	3.38
	grade the overall teach	ing 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 instr	uctor's lectures well pi	repared	5	0	1	2	11	8	6		1408/1518		4.41	4.43	4.51	3.57
2. Did the instru	ctor 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
	terial presented and exp	_	5	0	1	3	10	7	7		1321/1517		4.05		4.34	3.57
	es contribute to what yo		5	1	8	4	7	4	4	2.70	1480/1550	2.70	4.03	4.22	4.24	2.70
5. Did audiovisua	ır understanding	8	10	3	3	5	3	1	2.73	1221/1295	2.73	3.95	3.94	4.01	2.73	
	Discussion			_	_	_	_	_	_							
	ussions contribute to wh	-	32	0	1	0	0	0			****/1398		4.19		4.23	****
2. Were all stude		32	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1391		4.10	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instru	ctor encourage fair and	open discussion	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.50	****
	Laboratory		30	0	1	0		_								
	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material						0 1	2	0		****/ 224		4.25	4.10	4.49	****
	2. Were you provided with adequate background informati							1	1		****/ 240		4.12	4.11	4.26	****
	materials available for structor provide assista		30 30	0	0	1	2 1	0 1	0 1		****/ 219 ****/ 215		4.25	4.44	4.42 4.28	****
	nts for lab reports clea		30	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 198		4.27 4.54	4.35	4.20	****
5. were requiremen	_	arry specified	30	1	U	U	1	1	U	3.50	/ 190		4.54	4.10	4.21	
	Field Work															
_	rience contribute to wha	_	30	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 52		5.00	4.04	4.84	****
	y understand your evalua		30	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 53		5.00	4.05	4.58	****
	ctor available for consu		30	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 42		5.00	4.75	4.71	****
_	could you discuss your		30	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 37		5.00	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences	s help you carry out fie	eld activities	30	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.64	****
1 Did galf-maged	Self Paced system contribute to wh	nat vou learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	2	4 67	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.85	****
	acts with the instructor		30	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 43		5.00	4.69	4.85	****
-	ck/tutoring by proctors	_	31	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		5.00	4.37	4.67	****
	ugh proctors for all the	-	31	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21		5.00	4.52	4.50	****
		Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Τv	pe			Majors	}	
										0	 Graduat					
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 1 A 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 14				ке	quire	za I	or M	a jor	ಏ	U	Graduat	e	U	мајс	)Ľ	30
	26-33 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 4					1				0	Under-9	rad 3	33	Non-	-major	3
	34-150 16 3.00-3.49 12 D 0					-					onaci -g	raa .	, ,	14011		5
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0					ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	there a	re not	enouc	ıh
P 0									respons				_	•		
I 0 Other						3	0									

? 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: CMPE 491B 0101 Page 395 Title BIOMED ELECTRONICS FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: KOSTOV, IORDAN Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

			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	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			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	Λ	Λ	3 00	****/1398	****	4.19	4.07	4.23	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1391	****	4.10	4.30	4.48	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1388	****	4.58	4.28	4.50	****
5. Did the instructor encourage rail and open discussion	O	J	5	3	3	3	_	3.00	/1300		1.50	1.20	1.50	

Frequency 1	Distribution
-------------	--------------

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

#### Course-Section: CMPE 491N 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 NANOELECTRONICS FOR CM Job IRBR3029

Page 396

Fall 2007 Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD

Enrollment:	6			
Ouestionnaires:	6	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Frequencies					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	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

Credits Earned 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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: CMPE 646 0101 University of Maryland Title VLSI DESIGN VERIFICATI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2007 Instructor: PLUSQUELLIC, JA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Ctudont	COLLEGA	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

Page 397

						Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General																		
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						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	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
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.90	4.01	4.10	4.00
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504		3.74	4.05	4.29	4.67
	-	g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	2	0	1		1327/1612	3.67	3.26	4.16	4.27	3.67
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.87	4.08	4.17	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s 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 au	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.95	3.94	3.95	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.10	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.49	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	уре		Majors		;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 1	A 3		Per			or Ma	iore		0	Graduate 2			Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		1/5/	40TI	Lu I	J_ 110	, JOI 8	٥	J	Graduati	_	4	Ma JC	, <u>.</u>	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GCI	.1C1 a.	_				0	onaci g.	Luu	_	14011	101	O
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enor				enone	rh
02 00.	-	3.30 1.30	•	P 0								-					_	,==
				I O		Oth	ner					3		~	91		-	
							_											