

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	482/1509	4.75	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	807/1509	4.49	4.08	4.26	4.32	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	882/1287	4.49	4.05	4.30	4.35	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	911/1459	3.80	3.87	4.22	4.30	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1237/1406	3.20	3.71	4.09	4.09	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1384	4.06	3.79	4.11	4.09	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	986/1489	3.10	3.73	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	786/1463	3.97	3.97	4.09	4.08	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1173/1438	4.43	4.32	4.46	4.48	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1162/1421	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	841/1411	4.53	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	634/1405	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	4.33	3.83	4.00	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	487/1260	4.48	3.85	4.14	4.19	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1014/1255	4.33	4.06	4.33	4.37	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	770/1258	4.49	3.98	4.38	4.44	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	209/ 873	4.17	3.48	4.03	4.04	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.36	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.83	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.42	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.35	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.28	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: CMPE 212 2
 Title Prin Of Digital Design
 Instructor: Casale,David A.
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 349
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	2	8	4.64	446/1509	4.75	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	932/1509	4.49	4.08	4.26	4.32	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	678/1287	4.49	4.05	4.30	4.35	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	715/1459	3.80	3.87	4.22	4.30	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1333/1406	3.20	3.71	4.09	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1168/1384	4.06	3.79	4.11	4.09	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	707/1489	3.10	3.73	4.17	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1036/1463	3.97	3.97	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1116/1438	4.43	4.32	4.46	4.48	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1084/1421	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	841/1411	4.53	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	540/1405	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.39	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	0	3	1	3.00	1131/1236	4.33	3.83	4.00	4.11	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	746/1260	4.48	3.85	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	862/1255	4.33	4.06	4.33	4.37	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	889/1258	4.49	3.98	4.38	4.44	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	570/ 873	4.17	3.48	4.03	4.04	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.36	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	3.83	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.42	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.35	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.28	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: CMPE 212 3
 Title Prin Of Digital Design
 Instructor: Casale,David A.
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 350
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 212 4
 Title Prin Of Digital Design
 Instructor: Casale,David A.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 351
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.38	4.31	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.49	4.08	4.26	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.49	4.05	4.30	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.80	3.87	4.22	4.30	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1487/1489	3.10	3.73	4.17	4.19	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.96	4.79	4.67	4.61	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.43	4.32	4.46	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.53	4.09	4.31	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.33	3.83	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.48	3.85	4.14	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.33	4.06	4.33	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.49	3.98	4.38	4.44	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 306 2
 Title Intro Circuit Theory
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 352
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	410/1509	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.08	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	4.94	4.05	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	454/1459	4.75	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.75	3.71	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.86	3.79	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.83	3.73	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1463	4.82	3.97	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.78	4.32	4.46	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.89	4.09	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.97	4.10	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.76	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.75	3.85	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	4.72	4.06	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	4.72	3.98	4.38	4.42	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	37/ 184	4.42	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 198	4.18	3.83	4.22	4.17	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	77/ 184	4.68	4.42	4.48	4.52	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 177	4.75	4.35	4.36	4.30	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 165	4.75	4.28	4.18	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 306 3
 Title Intro Circuit Theory
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 353
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1509	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.08	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	143/1287	4.94	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1459	4.75	3.87	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	332/1406	4.75	3.71	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	182/1384	4.86	3.79	4.11	4.15	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1489	4.83	3.73	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	222/1463	4.82	3.97	4.09	4.08	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	247/1438	4.78	4.32	4.46	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1411	4.89	4.09	4.31	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1405	4.97	4.10	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	86/1236	4.76	3.83	4.00	4.07	4.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	415/1260	4.75	3.85	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	629/1255	4.72	4.06	4.33	4.37	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	680/1258	4.72	3.98	4.38	4.42	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	3.48	4.03	4.08	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	96/ 184	4.42	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	172/ 198	4.18	3.83	4.22	4.17	3.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	68/ 184	4.68	4.42	4.48	4.52	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	87/ 177	4.75	4.35	4.36	4.30	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	52/ 165	4.75	4.28	4.18	4.11	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CMPE 310 1
 Title Systems Design & Prog
 Instructor: Patel,Chintan
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 354
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	8	4	3.60	1331/1509	3.60	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	7	4	3.60	1134/1287	3.60	4.05	4.30	4.33	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1151/1459	3.82	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1225/1406	3.43	3.71	4.09	4.12	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	7	4	1	3.29	1280/1384	3.29	3.79	4.11	4.15	3.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	8	7	2	3.35	1355/1489	3.35	3.73	4.17	4.14	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1127/1506	4.45	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	11	0	3.73	1117/1463	3.73	3.97	4.09	4.08	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	981/1438	4.35	4.32	4.46	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	9	7	3	3.60	1256/1411	3.60	4.09	4.31	4.29	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	7	8	3	3.63	1230/1405	3.63	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	6	4	5	3.93	741/1236	3.93	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	832/1260	3.94	3.85	4.14	4.22	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	7	6	4.06	886/1255	4.06	4.06	4.33	4.37	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	856/1258	4.19	3.98	4.38	4.42	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	3.48	4.03	4.08	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	75/ 184	4.30	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	3.83	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	101/ 184	4.56	4.42	4.48	4.52	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	148/ 177	3.90	4.35	4.36	4.30	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	88/ 165	4.20	4.28	4.18	4.11	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	Under-grad	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 4		

Course-Section: CMPE 314 1
 Title Prin Of Electronic Cir
 Instructor: Yan,Li
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 355
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	953/1509	4.09	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	859/1509	3.63	4.08	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	668/1287	3.69	4.05	4.30	4.33	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	979/1459	3.50	3.87	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.71	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	531/1384	4.17	3.79	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	1127/1489	3.94	3.73	4.17	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	8	1	3.77	1092/1463	3.38	3.97	4.09	4.08	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	852/1438	4.23	4.32	4.46	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1138/1421	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1116/1411	3.72	4.09	4.31	4.29	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1241/1405	3.80	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	6	2	2	3.17	1099/1236	3.17	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1260	3.00	3.85	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1255	3.00	4.06	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1258	2.00	3.98	4.38	4.42	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	176/ 198	3.32	3.83	4.22	4.17	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	171/ 184	3.95	4.42	4.48	4.52	3.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	103/ 177	4.18	4.35	4.36	4.30	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	7	3	4.00	103/ 165	4.00	4.28	4.18	4.11	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 314 2
 Title Prin Of Electronic Cir
 Instructor: Yan,Li
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 356
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.09	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1463/1509	3.63	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.69	4.05	4.30	4.33	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.50	3.87	4.22	4.26	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	807/1384	4.17	3.79	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	986/1489	3.94	3.73	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1392/1463	3.38	3.97	4.09	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.23	4.32	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1411	3.72	4.09	4.31	4.29	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1047/1405	3.80	4.10	4.32	4.32	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.85	4.14	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	4.06	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1255/1258	2.00	3.98	4.38	4.42	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	193/ 198	3.32	3.83	4.22	4.17	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	161/ 184	3.95	4.42	4.48	4.52	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	141/ 177	4.18	4.35	4.36	4.30	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	103/ 165	4.00	4.28	4.18	4.11	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 323 1
 Title Signal/Systems Theory
 Instructor: Robucci,Ryan W
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 357
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1251/1509	3.86	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	2	3.71	1283/1509	3.71	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	0	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	4.05	4.30	4.33	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	3	1	4	0	2.89	1443/1459	2.89	3.87	4.22	4.26	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1319/1406	3.10	3.71	4.09	4.12	3.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1356/1384	2.78	3.79	4.11	4.15	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	2	5	1	1	3.11	1396/1489	3.11	3.73	4.17	4.14	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	8	0	3.42	1289/1463	3.42	3.97	4.09	4.08	3.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	1182/1438	4.07	4.32	4.46	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	1322/1421	4.14	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	8	2	2	3.21	1339/1411	3.21	4.09	4.31	4.29	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1336/1405	3.14	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	6	1	4	3.46	1002/1236	3.46	3.83	4.00	4.07	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.85	4.14	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1023/1255	3.83	4.06	4.33	4.37	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.67	3.98	4.38	4.42	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.48	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	0	7	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1331/1509	3.60	4.08	4.26	4.26	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1134/1287	3.60	4.05	4.30	4.38	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1367/1459	3.33	3.87	4.22	4.32	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	1369/1406	2.80	3.71	4.09	4.11	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	5	0	1	3.00	1322/1384	3.00	3.79	4.11	4.23	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	3.73	4.17	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	917/1506	4.70	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1194/1463	3.63	3.97	4.09	4.18	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.32	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1217/1421	4.40	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1145/1411	3.90	4.09	4.31	4.35	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	2	3	3.20	1330/1405	3.20	4.10	4.32	4.34	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	3.83	4.00	4.03	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1260	****	3.85	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1255	****	4.06	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1258	****	3.98	4.38	4.51	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.62	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	3.83	4.22	4.37	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	77/ 184	4.67	4.42	4.48	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	110/ 177	4.33	4.35	4.36	4.47	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	103/ 165	4.00	4.28	4.18	4.29	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	6	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 419 1
 Title Comp Arth Algo, & Impl
 Instructor: Phatak,Dhananja
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 359
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1259/1509	3.75	4.08	4.26	4.26	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.05	4.30	4.38	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.71	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1370/1384	2.50	3.79	4.11	4.23	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1374/1489	3.25	3.73	4.17	4.18	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.50	3.97	4.09	4.18	3.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.32	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1389/1411	2.75	4.09	4.31	4.35	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1265/1405	3.50	4.10	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1188/1236	2.67	3.83	4.00	4.03	2.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 423 1
 Title Communication Engng
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 360
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	424/1509	4.60	4.08	4.26	4.26	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.05	4.30	4.38	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1299/1406	3.20	3.71	4.09	4.11	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.79	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	597/1489	4.40	3.73	4.17	4.18	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1300/1506	4.20	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	3.97	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.32	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.10	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CMPE 450 2
 Title Capstone I
 Instructor: Pinkston,John T
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 361
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	447/1509	4.58	4.08	4.26	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	844/1287	4.17	4.05	4.30	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	770/1459	4.25	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.71	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1107/1384	3.67	3.79	4.11	4.23	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	0	5	3.58	1271/1489	3.58	3.73	4.17	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	228/1463	4.64	3.97	4.09	4.18	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.32	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1010/1405	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.34	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	3.83	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1102/1260	3.33	3.85	4.14	4.25	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.06	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.67	3.98	4.38	4.51	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.36	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.83	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.42	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.35	4.36	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	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 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CMPE 486 1
 Title Mobile Radio Comm
 Instructor: Green, Frank E
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 362
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	3	3.36	1415/1509	3.36	4.08	4.26	4.26	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1123/1287	3.64	4.05	4.30	4.38	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	979/1459	4.00	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	5	3	1	4	3.31	1267/1406	3.31	3.71	4.09	4.11	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.79	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1184/1489	3.79	3.73	4.17	4.18	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	896/1506	4.71	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	4	7	1	3.50	1241/1463	3.50	3.97	4.09	4.18	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	904/1438	4.43	4.32	4.46	4.50	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	971/1411	4.14	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	874/1405	4.29	4.10	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	625/1236	4.08	3.83	4.00	4.03	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	352/1260	4.60	3.85	4.14	4.25	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.06	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1258	5.00	3.98	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.48	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CMPE 491 1
 Title Spec Topic In Comp Eng
 Instructor: Menyuk, Curtis R
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 363
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.08	4.26	4.26	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.05	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	3.87	4.22	4.32	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	3.71	4.09	4.11	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	4.75	3.79	4.11	4.23	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.73	4.17	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.79	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.75	3.97	4.09	4.18	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	930/1438	4.40	4.32	4.46	4.50	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.09	4.31	4.35	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.10	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	421/1236	4.33	3.83	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.85	4.14	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1127/1255	3.50	4.06	4.33	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1143/1258	3.50	3.98	4.38	4.51	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: CMPE 645 1
 Title Computer Arithmetic
 Instructor: Phatak,Dhananja
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 364
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1340/1509	3.67	4.38	4.31	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1419/1509	3.33	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	4.05	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.00	3.87	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1105/1406	3.67	3.71	4.09	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.00	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1359/1489	3.33	3.73	4.17	4.14	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	3.97	4.09	4.15	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1406/1438	3.00	4.32	4.46	4.49	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.73	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1411	3.50	4.09	4.31	4.33	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1348/1405	3.00	4.10	4.32	4.33	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1197/1236	2.50	3.83	4.00	3.98	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.85	4.14	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	4.06	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1222/1258	3.00	3.98	4.38	4.50	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	870/ 873	1.00	3.48	4.03	4.01	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1065/1509	4.08	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	1326/1509	3.62	4.08	4.26	4.25	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	2	3.46	1176/1287	3.46	4.05	4.30	4.22	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1301/1459	3.54	3.87	4.22	4.16	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	6	1	3.55	1162/1406	3.55	3.71	4.09	4.12	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	4	1	3.42	1230/1384	3.42	3.79	4.11	4.16	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1094/1489	3.92	3.73	4.17	4.14	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1323/1463	3.30	3.97	4.09	4.15	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1255/1438	3.92	4.32	4.46	4.49	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1320/1421	4.15	4.73	4.73	4.78	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1225/1411	3.69	4.09	4.31	4.33	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	2	3.62	1237/1405	3.62	4.10	4.32	4.33	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1078/1236	3.25	3.83	4.00	3.98	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	5	0	0	2.71	1216/1260	2.71	3.85	4.14	4.21	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	4.06	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1240/1258	2.86	3.98	4.38	4.50	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 873	****	3.48	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.36	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	3.83	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	4.42	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	4.35	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.28	4.18	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	6	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						