Course-Section: CMPE 212 0101

Title PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN

Instructor: CASALE, DAVID

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 405 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions		NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies	4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Rai	_	Course	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5 1	General	5	0	0	0	0		-	1.0	4 55	E 41 /	1556	4 55	4 00	4 20	4 25	4 55
	gain new insights, skill		2	0	0	0	4	1	16	4.57	541/			4.29	4.30	4.35	4.57
	instructor make clear t		2	0	2	1	3	6	9		1237/		3.90	3.88	4.27	4.32	3.90
	exam questions reflect		2	0	3	2	3	9	4		1241/		3.43	3.97	4.32	4.41	3.43
	r evaluations reflect t		2	1	3	3	2	5	7		1362/		3.50	3.79	4.25	4.26	3.50
	gned readings contribut		3	5 3	2 2	1	7 5	3	2		1362/		3.13	3.45	4.12	4.09	3.13
		ute to what you learned	3	_	2	3	-	1			1282/			3.71	4.14	4.06	3.35
	grading system clearly		3	0	0	3	1 0		10		1182/			3.66	4.19	4.22	3.85
-	times was class cancel d you grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	3 7	1	3	0	1	3 6	17 5	4.85 3.67	567/ 1227/		4.85 3.67	4.84 3.89	4.64 4.10	4.62 4.05	4.85 3.67
	Lecture																
1. Were the	instructor's lectures	well prepared	4	0	2	1	1	6	9	4.00	1233/	1488	4.00	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.00
	instructor seem interes		4	0	2	1	0	5	11	4.16	1387/	1493	4.16	4.51	4.73	4.75	4.16
	are material presented	_	4	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	951/	1486	4.26	3.88	4.32	4.29	4.26
	lectures contribute to		4	0	0	2	0	4	13	4.47	731/	1489	4.47	3.91	4.32	4.31	4.47
	ovisual techniques enha		4	14	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/			3.85	4.03	4.01	****
	Discussi			_		_			_								
	discussions contribut	-	8	0	5	2	2	3	3		1224/		2.80	3.58	4.17	4.14	2.80
	students actively enco		8	0	2	4	4	1	4		1203/		3.07	3.62	4.35	4.30	3.07
	instructor encourage fa	_	8	0	2	3	1	3	6		1107/		3.53	3.67	4.35	4.29	3.53
4. Were spec	cial techniques success	ful	8	9	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	876/	878	1.67	2.71	4.05	3.92	1.67
1 Did the 1	Laborato lab increase understand	-	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/	234	****	4.22	4.23	4.44	****
		background information	19	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/		****	4.01	4.35	4.47	****
	essary materials availa		19	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/		****	4.01	4.51	4.65	****
	lab instructor provide		19	0	1	1	1	1	0		****/		****	4.08	4.29	4.38	****
	airements for lab repor		17	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	229/		4.00	3.92	4.20	4.29	4.00
	Seminar																
1. Were assi	igned topics relevant t	o the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****
5. Were crit	teria for grading made	clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	375	****	3.17	4.01	4.21	****
	Field Wo	rk															
5. Did confe	erences help you carry	out field activities	18	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/	326	****	3.03	4.03	4.43	****
,	Self Pa				•	•			•		2421				4 00		
5. Were ther	re enough proctors for	all the students	12	0	0	0	11	0	0	3.00	313/	382	3.00	3.24	4.08	4.39	3.00
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utic	n										
Credits Earn	ned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	\$				Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27		0 A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Gra	duat	e	0	Majo	 or	22
28-55		0 B 8		~		,				0				2.2	37		-
56-83		1 C 1		Gei	nera:	Τ				0	Und	er-g	rad 2	23	Non-	-major	1
84-150 Grad.		6 D 0 4 F 0		Electives						0			Means t			_	jh
		P 0 I 0	Other						1	.9	res	pons	es to k	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
	I 0 Other								_	-							

Course-Section: CMPE 306 0101

Title INTRO CIRCUIT THEORY

Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

# Spring 2009

Page 406 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General	 															
1. Did y	ou gain new	insights,skil		n this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	235/1576	4.81	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.81
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	279/1576	4.75	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.75
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	381/1342	4.69	3.97	4.32	4.30	4.69
4. Did o	ther evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	4	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1153/1520	3.92	3.79	4.25	4.25	3.92
5. Did a	ssigned rea	dings contribu	ite to v	what you learned	0	4	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	3.45	4.12	4.09	3.50
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	448/1434	4.46	3.71	4.14	4.15	4.46
7. Was t	he grading	system clearly	/ explai	ned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	527/1547	4.50	3.66	4.19	4.21	4.50
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0				972/1574	4.63		4.64	4.61	4.63
9. How w	ould you gr	rade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	138/1554	4.86	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.86
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were	the instruc	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.13	4.47	4.47	4.75
		or seem intere		_	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.51	4.73	4.70	4.88
		_		plained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6		4.50	678/1486	4.50	3.88	4.32		4.50
	he lectures		0	0	0	0	1			4.69	474/1489	4.69	3.91			4.69		
5. Did a	udiovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	2	3	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	438/1277	4.36	3.85	4.03	4.11	4.36
		Discuss																
		what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3			****/1279	****	3.30	4.17		****		
		_	_	l to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/1270	****	3.62	4.35	4.42	****
		d open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/1269	****	3.67	4.35	4.41	****		
4. Were	special tec	chniques succes		13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	2.71	4.05	4.09	****	
		Laborat																
		rease understar			9	0	0	0	1	4			147/ 234		4.22	4.23	4.24	4.14
		_	_	ground information	9	0	0	0	1	3		4.29	141/ 240	4.29	4.01	4.35	4.32	
	_			or lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	3		4.14	194/ 229	4.14	4.02	4.51		4.14
		ructor providers for lab repo		cance early specified	9 5	0	0	0	1 2	3 6		4.29	139/ 232 210/ 379	4.29 4.09	4.08 3.92	4.29	4.16 4.17	
		_			_		-		_	-	_							
Г Моне		Semina:			11	0	0	0	4	1	0	2 20	254/ 275	2 20	2 17	4 01	4 10	2 20
5. were	criteria id	or grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	4	1	U	3.20	254/ 375	3.20	3.1/	4.01	4.12	3.20
		Field V																
5. Did c	onferences	help you carry	out fi	leld activities	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.03	4.03	4.23	3.00
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students						0	0	5	0	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.33
	F							ution	ı									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	sons				Туј	oe .			Majors	<b>;</b>
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6																	
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 6 B 6		Rec	quire	ed fo	r Ma	jor	s	U	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	10
28-55 56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 3		Cor	neral					0	Under-gr	rad 1	.6	Non	major	6
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 5 D 1						·c·a	-				-	onder gi			14011_	, О	5
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	are not	enoua	rh
	P 0											-	response				_	•
	I 0						ner				1	5			5-			
	I 0																	

Course-Section: CMPE 310 0101

Title SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG

Instructor: MOHAMMADPOURRAD

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 11

# Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 407 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

			Questions	3			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructo Ra	or ink	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General																		
1. Die	d vou d	gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	ے	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1316/	1576	3.82	4.29	4.30	4.30	3.82
	_	_	tor make clear			_	0	0	2	2	5	1	1		1554/			3.88	4.27	4.28	2.73
			estions reflect	_	_	3	0	0	2	1	7	0		2.73				3.97	4.32	4.30	2.73
		_	ations reflect	_	_	3	0	1	1	1	4	3		3.20				3.79	4.25	4.25	3.20
			adings contribu			rned	0	0	0	3	2	5		3.36				3.45	4.12	4.09	3.36
			ignments contri		_		0	2	0	3	1	4		3.33				3.71	4.14		3.33
			-		_	earneu	0	0	5	3	2	1									1.91
	-		system clearly	_	.eu		0	0	0	0	0	1		1.91 4.91					4.19		
	_		was class cance		na offoatir	ronoaa	3	1	0	1	4	2			,			4.84		4.61	
9. HO	w would	a you g	rade the overal	.i teachi	ng errectiv	veness	3	1	U	1	4	2	U	3.14	1420/	1554	3.14	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.14
			Lecture	2																	
1. We:	re the	instru	ctor's lectures	well pr	epared		0	0	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	1413/	1488	3.36	4.13	4.47	4.47	3.36
			tor seem intere	_	_	t.	0	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64				4.51	4.73	4.70	3.64
			erial presented				0	0	1	4	4	1		2.73				3.88	4.32		2.73
			s contribute to			AL	0	0	2	1	4	2		3.09				3.91	4.32	4.34	
			techniques enh			ndina	0	2	1	4	2	1					2.67		4.03	4.11	
J. DI	a auai	JVIBUUI	ccciniiques cini	iance you	i unaciscai	ildilig	O	2	_	•	2	_	_	2.07	121)	12//	2.07	3.03	1.05	1.11	2.07
			Discussion discussions contribute to what you learned																		
1. Die	d class	s discu	ssions contribu	ite to wh	at you lear	rned	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1186/	1279	3.00	3.58	4.17	4.20	3.00
2. We:	re all	studen	ts actively end	ouraged	to particip	oate	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1243/	1270	2.67	3.62	4.35	4.42	2.67
3. Dio	d the	instruc	tor encourage f	air and	open discus	ssion	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1244/	1269	2.67	3.67	4.35	4.41	2.67
			chniques succes		-		8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	878		2.71	4.05	4.09	****
			Laborat	ory																	
1 Dia	d the	lah inc	rease understan	-	the materia	al	7	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	209/	234	3.50	4.22	4.23	4.24	3.50
			led with adequat				7	0	0	1	2	1	-	3.00	,	240	3.00	4.01	4.35		3.00
			materials avail				8	0	0	0	3	0		3.00		229	3.00	4.02	4.51		3.00
		_	tructor provide			ICICS	8	0	0	0	1	2		3.67		232	3.67	4.08	4.29		3.67
			ts for lab repo			i ad	3	1	0	1	0	6	-	3.71						4.17	
J. WE.	re requ	all ellen	ics for fab repo	ics ciea	ily specifi	ieu	J		U	1	U	O	U	3.71	332/	317	3.71	3.92	1.20	1.1/	3.71
			Seminar	:																	
1. We:	re ass:	igned t	opics relevant	to the a	nnounced th	neme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	****	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was	s the :	instruc	tor available f	or indiv	idual atter	ntion	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Dio	d resea	arch pr	ojects contribu	ite to wh	at you lear	rned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	72	****	****	4.64	4.53	****
			ns contribute t				10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	80	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
			or grading made				4	0	0	1	5	1	0		287/		3.00	3.17	4.01		3.00
			3 3																		
			Field W																		
5. Die	d confe	erences	help you carry	out fie	ld activiti	ies	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/	326	****	3.03	4.03	4.23	****
			Self P	)agod																	
5. We:	re the	ere enough proctors for all the students						0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/	382	****	3.24	4.08	4.24	****
			.J F				9	-	-	-	_	-	-		,						
						Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı										
Credi	ts Earı	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected (	Grades				Rea	asons	\$				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 0		 1	0 00 0 00	0	 Д 1	 1								·				·	 Ma≐a		11
00-2' 28-5		0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0		1 2		кес	1urre	eu ro	or Ma	Jors	Si .	0	Gra	duat	E	0	Majo	Σ	11
		-		•				<b>G</b> -		ı				0	TT	1		1	<b>3</b> 7		^
56-8		2	2.00-2.99	0		1		Ger	neral	L				0	unc	ler-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	0
84-1		2	3.00-3.49	1		0								0	0.00	ш.	Maar - '	la aur -			.lo
Grad	•	0	3.50-4.00	4	= -	0 n		E⊥€	ectiv	/es				0			Means t			_	111

I 0 Other 10 ? 7

Course-Section: CMPE 314 0101

Title PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR

Instructor: ROBUCCI, RYAN W

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

# Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 408 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	nı dəin net	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4 20	1019/1576	4.20	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.20
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	_		1292/1576		3.88	4.27	4.28	3.80
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	5		4.00			3.97	4.32	4.30	4.00
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	2			1041/1520		3.79	4.25	4.25	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1		4.25	647/1465		3.45	4.12	4.09	4.25
				o what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2			1142/1434			4.14		3.67
		system clearly			0	1	0	0	0	3		4.25	838/1547		3.66	4.19		4.25
		was class cance		IIIeu	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1574		4.84	4.64	4.61	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	1			1405/1554					3.20
9. HOW WC	Julu you gi	rade the overa.	II teac.	ning effectiveness	U	U	U	U	4	1	U	3.20	1405/1554	3.20	3.09	4.10	4.03	3.20
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lecture:	s well ;	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1433/1488	3.20	4.13	4.47	4.47	3.20
2. Did th	ne instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.51	4.73	4.70	4.80
3. Was le	ecture mate	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	1466/1486	2.60	3.88	4.32	4.32	2.60
4. Did th	ne lectures	s contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1236/1489	3.80	3.91	4.32	4.34	3.80
5. Did av	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.85	4.03	4.11	4.00
		D																
1 543 1		Discus			4	0	0	0	0	1	^	4 00	++++/1070		2 50	4 1 7	4 00	****
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1279		3.58	4.17	4.20	****
				d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1270		3.62	4.35	4.42	****
		_		d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269		3.67	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succes	ssiul		4	U	U	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	2.71	4.05	4.09	****
		Labora	cory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 234	4.50	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.50
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequat	e back	ground information	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	198/ 240	4.00	4.01	4.35	4.32	4.00
3. Were n	necessary r	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.02	4.51	4.48	4.00
4. Did th	ne lab inst	tructor provide	assis	tance	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	165/ 232	4.00	4.08	4.29	4.16	4.00
5. Were r	requirement	ts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	367/ 379	3.25	3.92	4.20	4.17	3.25
		Field V	Jowle															
5. Did co	onferences			ield activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.03	4.03	4.23	****
		Self			4	0			_	•	•					4 00		
5. Were t	Were there enough proctors for all the students						0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.24	****
	Fr							ution	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0								or Ma	ioro		0	 Graduat		 0	Majo		 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		vec	JUTTE	LU L	or Md	ייסדצ	,	J	Graduat	C	J	Ma JC	/_	5
56-83							nera:	1				0	Under-9	rad	5	Non-	-major	0
	84-150 2 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						ici a.	_				U	onder-9	_ au	J	INOII	ila jui	U
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					<b>교</b> 1∠	ectiv	ves.				0	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0							v CD				-	respons				_	,++
	I 0					Oth	her					5	I CSPOIIS		,c 5191.	ıııcaı		
	I 0 ? 1					001						_						
	? 1																	

Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMPE 315 0101

14

PRIN VLSI DESIGN

PATEL, CHINTAN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 409

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		 General																
1. Did you	ı gain new	insights, skil	ls from th	is course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.67
2. Did the	e instructo	or make clear	the expecte	ed goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	851/1576	4.33	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.33
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	the expect	ed goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	696/1342	4.42	3.97	4.32	4.30	4.42
4. Did oth	ner evaluat	tions reflect	the expecte	ed goals	2	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.86	3.79	4.25	4.25	4.86
5. Did ass	signed read	dings contribu	te to what	you learned	0	8	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1102/1465	3.75	3.45	4.12	4.09	3.75
6. Did wri	itten assi	nments contri	bute to wha	at you learned	0	5	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	797/1434	4.14	3.71	4.14	4.15	4.14
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	explained	-	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	375/1547	4.64	3.66	4.19	4.21	4.64
8. How man	ny times wa	as class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	813/1574	4.73	4.84	4.64	4.61	4.73
9. How wou	ıld you gra	ade the overal	l teaching	effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.67	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.67
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instruct	tor's lectures	well prepa	ared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.13	4.47	4.47	4.91
2. Did the	e instructo	or seem intere	ested in the	e subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.51	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was led	Mas lecture material presented and explained clea wid the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	6	6	4.50	678/1486	4.50	3.88	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the	e lectures	Learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	801/1489	4.42	3.91	4.32	4.34	4.42		
5. Did aud	diovisual d	techniques enh	nance your w	understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.85	4.03	4.11	5.00
		Discuss																
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contribu	you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.58	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were al	ll student:	participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	3.62	4.35	4.42	4.50		
3. Did the	e instructo	en discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.25	3.67	4.35	4.41	4.25		
4. Were sp	pecial tech		8	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	2.71	4.05	4.09	****		
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did the	e lab incre	ease understar	nding of the	e material	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	50/ 234	4.67	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.67
2. Were yo	ou provide	d with adequat	e backgrou	nd information	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.01	4.35	4.32	5.00
3. Were ne	ecessary ma	aterials avail	able for la	ab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.02	4.51	4.48	5.00
4. Did the	e lab inst	ructor provide	assistance	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.08	4.29	4.16	5.00
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts clearly	y specified	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	99/ 379	4.43	3.92	4.20	4.17	4.43
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did con	nferences l	nelp you carry	out field	activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	***	3.03	4.03	4.23	****
		Self I				0												
5. Were th	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students							0	3	5	0	3.63	206/ 382	3.63	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.63
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	cribu	utior	1											
Credits Ea	arned	spected Grades				Rea	asons				Тур	pe			Majors			
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5							ed fo	or Ma	iors	 S	0	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	 r	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6			\			J						, 0		=
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 1		Ger	neral	1				1	Under-gr	rad 1	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0												5-				J	-
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
	P 0												response				_	
	I 0										1	1	_		3			
	? 0																	

Course-Section: CMPE 320 0101

Title PROB, STAT, & RANDOM P

Questions

PINKSTON, JOHN Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 410 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

		General																
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	541/1576	4.58		4.30	4.30	4.58
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	,	4.58	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.58
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	1	0	6			562/1342		3.97		4.30	4.53
		uations reflect			0	9	0	0	1	5			805/1520	4.30	3.79	4.25	4.25	4.30
	_	eadings contribu		_	0	1	1	1	9	2			1242/1465	3.50	3.45	4.12	4.09	3.50
		_		what you learned	0	6 0	1	0	1 4	4 7	7 8	4.23	- , -	4.23	3.71	4.14	4.15	4.23
		g system clearly was class cance	_	nea	0	0	0	0	0	0	8 19	5.00	,	5.00	3.66 4.84	4.19 4.64	4.21	4.21
	_			ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	8		623/1554				4.01	
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
		uctor's lectures	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84			4.13	4.47	4.47	4.84
		ctor seem intere		_	0	0	0	0	0	3			708/1493		4.51		4.70	
		terial presented			0	0	0	0	1	9			792/1486		3.88			4.42
		es contribute to	_		0	0	0	0	2	_			474/1489			4.32		
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	0	7	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	839/1277	3.83	3.85	4.03	4.11	3.83
1 Did al	agg digg	Discuss ussions contribu		hat you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/1279	****	3 5Ω	4.17	4.20	***
		nts actively end			18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1270	****		4.35	4.42	****
				open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1269	****		4.35	4.41	****
		echniques succes			18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 878	****		4.05		***
5. Were r	equireme	Laborat nts for lab repo	-	arly specified	14	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.92	4.20	4.17	4.00
	- 1	_																
5. Were c	riteria :	Seminar for grading made			14	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.20	3.17	4.01	4.12	3.20
		Field W	Jork															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	12	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	237/ 326	3.14	3.03	4.03	4.23	3.14
5 Were t	here eno	Self F ugh proctors for		e students	13	0	0	0	6	0	0	3 00	313/ 382	3 00	3 24	4 08	4 24	3 00
o. Were e.	nere eno	agn proceeds for	arr cir	Frequ		-	Ü	Ū	Ü	Ü	Ü	3.00	3137 302	3.00	3.21	1.00	1.21	3.00
				-	iency	DIS	CLID	ucio	11									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason:	s 			Тур	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7 B 7		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduate	9	0	Majo	or	18
28-55 56-83	0 1	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 0	B 7 C 2		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-gi	rad 1	L9	Non-	-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0									3				-	
Grad.								ves				0	#### - N	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
	P 0									response	es to b	oe sign	nifican	nt				
I 0						Ot1	her				1	8						
	? 3																	

Course-Section: CMPE 330 0101

Title EM WAVES TRANSMISSION

Instructor: CASALE, DAVID A

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 411 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did v	on gain ne	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	1	2	3	9	2	3 53	1438/1576	3 53	4.29	4.30	4.30	3.53
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	7	5	3		1387/1576	3.53	3.88	4.27	4.28	3.53
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	6	8	3		1101/1342		3.97		4.30	3.82
		uations reflect			0	0	1	4	7	5	-		1479/1520		3.79	4.25	4.25	2.94
			_	hat you learned	1	3	1	1	4	5			1262/1465			4.12	4.09	3.46
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	6	1	4	6	0		1412/1434	2.59	3.71	4.14	4.15	2.59
		g system clearl			0	0	1	2	2	8			1259/1547			4.19		3.71
		was class canc		iica	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574			4.64		
	_			ing effectiveness	1	0	1	2	8	5			1437/1554					
J. 110W W	outu you s	grade ene overa	II ccacii	ing circuit venebb	-	Ü	-	_	O	J	J	3.00	1137,1331	3.00	3.05	1.10	1.05	3.00
		Lectur	_															
			1	0	0	2	4	10	0		1388/1488	3.50		4.47	4.47	3.50		
2. Did tl	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared wid the instructor seem interested in the subjections are material presented and explained cle					0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1449/1493	3.81	4.51	4.73	4.70	3.81
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	1	0	1	4	5	6	0	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	3.88	4.32	4.32	3.00
4. Did tl	he lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	1	0	2	3	7	3	1	2.88	1443/1489	2.88	3.91	4.32	4.34	2.88
5. Did a	udiovisual	ur understanding	1	14	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.85	4.03	4.11	****		
		_ ,																
1 Did a	logg digg	Discus		hat you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/1279	****	3.58	4.17	4.20	****
				to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1270	****	3.62			****
				open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1269	****	3.62	4.35	4.42 4.41	****
J. DIG CI	ne mstruc	ctor encourage	Lair and	open discussion	10	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	71209		3.07	4.33	4.41	
		Labora	tory															
5. Were	requiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 379	****	3.92	4.20	4.17	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were	criteria f	for grading mad	e clear		13	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 375	****	3.17	4.01	4.12	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carr		eld activities	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.03	4.03	4.23	****
			-															
		Self																
5. Were	there enou	ugh proctors for	r all th	e students	11	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.33
		Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n											
Credits 1	Earned	Expected Grades				Re:	ason	S			Ту	ne			Majors			
								- 										
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6									_					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Gei	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.							ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0						ner				1	.2						
		? 1																

Course-Section: CMPE 422 0101 University of Maryland Title DIGITAL SIGNAL PROCESS Baltimore County

Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 412 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	S		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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.29	4.30	4.46	4.67
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	542/1576	4.56	3.88	4.27	4.35	4.56
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	406/1342	4.67	3.97	4.32	4.46	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	376/1520	4.63	3.79	4.25	4.38	4.63
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	te to	what you learned	0	6	0	3	4	2	3	3.42	1287/1465	3.42	3.45	4.12	4.22	3.42
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	2	7	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1015/1434	3.89	3.71	4.14	4.30	3.89
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	527/1547	4.50	3.66	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	lled		1	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1189/1574	4.41	4.84	4.64	4.69	4.41
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	180/1554	4.78	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.78
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instri	actor's lectures	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.13	4.47	4.55	4.67	
		ctor seem intere		0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.51	4.73	4.80	5.00	
			xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	841/1486	4.39	3.88	4.32	4.41	4.39	
		you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6		4.56		4.56	3.91		4.38			
			our understanding	1	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	429/1277	4.38	3.85	4.03	4.04	4.38	
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made			17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.17	4.01	3.90	****
5. Did co	nferences	Field W s help you carry		ield activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.03	4.03	3.97	****
J. Dia co		s help you early	out 1	icia accivicios	Ξ,	Ü	Ü	Ü	J	_	J	1.00	, 320		3.03	1.05	3.57	
		Self P																
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors for	all t	he students	13	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	208/ 382	3.60	3.24	4.08	3.88	3.60
		Frequ	iency	/ Dist	tribu	ution	n											
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re:	asons	s			Ty	pe			Majors			
										- 								
00-27								ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			neral					•	1	, .				•
56-83								L				9	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	0
	84-150 6 3.00-3.49 5 D 0																	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	n
	P 0												respons	es to k	e sıgr	nifican	1t	

Other

10

I 0

1

Baltimore County

Course-Section: CMPE 451 0101

29

CAPSTONE II

PINKSTON, JOHN

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Page 413 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General new insights,skills fro uctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	1	5 5	19 12	4.72	347/1576 1177/1576		4.29	4.30 4.27	4.46	4.72 3.96
	questions reflect the		0	17	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	972/1342		3.97	4.32	4.46	4.00
	luations reflect the ex	_	0	1	0	3	2				913/1520			4.25	4.38	
	readings contribute to ssignments contribute		1	16 4	0 2	2	2 2	2 9			1242/1465 878/1434		3.45	4.12	4.22	3.50 4.00
	ng system clearly expla		0	5	4	2	8				1449/1547			4.19	4.24	
	s was class cancelled		1	0	2	0	1	0			1018/1574			4.64	4.69	4.58
9. How would you	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	11	7	4.09	881/1554	4.09	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.09
	Lecture															
1. Were the inst	ructor's lectures well	prepared	8	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	846/1488	4.53	4.13	4.47	4.55	4.53
	uctor seem interested		6 7	0	0	0	1	6			1150/1493		4.51	4.73	4.80	
	as lecture material presented and explained cle id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					0	1	7			678/1486		3.88	4.32	4.41	
			7 8	0 7	2	1 1	6 2	4			1313/1489 692/1277		3.91	4.32	4.38	
J. Dia audiovisu	ar techniques enhance	your understanding	0	,	U	1	2	J	-	1.00	072/12/1	4.00	3.03	4.03	1.01	1.00
1 - 1 1 1 1	Discussion		0.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	**** /1000	de de de de	2 50	4 1 1	4 21	****
	cussions contribute to ents actively encourage	-	22 22	0	0	0	0	0 1	3 2		****/1279 ****/1270		3.58 3.62	4.17 4.35	4.31	****
	uctor encourage fair a		22	0	0	0	1	0	_		****/1269			4.35		****
J. Did the insti	_	ia open arbeablion	22	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	1.33	7 1203		3.07	1.55	1.33	
1 Did the lah i	Laboratory ncrease understanding (	of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.28	****
	ided with adequate back		24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240		4.01	4.35	4.45	****
	y materials available	_	24	0	0	0	0	1	-		****/ 229		4.02	4.51	4.70	****
	nstructor provide assi:		24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.08	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were requirem	ents for lab reports c	learly specified	20	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 379	****	3.92	4.20	4.19	****
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria	for grading made clear	c	20	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.17	4.01	3.90	****
	Field Work															
5. Did conference	es help you carry out :	field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	3.03	4.03	3.97	***
	Self Paced															
5. Were there en	. Were there enough proctors for all the students						8	1	1	3.30	257/ 382	3.30	3.24	4.08	3.88	3.30
	F															
Credits Earned	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							S			Ту	pe			Majors	ı
00-27 3	0.00-0.99 0	A 15		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	`s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	25
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5			_			-					. =			_
56-83 0 84-150 7	2.00-2.99 2 3.00-3.49 12	C 1 D 0		Ger	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	0
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
	P 0										respons					
	I 0		Otł	her				2	14							
	? 2															

Course-Section: CMPE 491A 0101

Title ADV COMP ARITHMETIC AL

Instructor: PHATAK, DHANANJ

Enrollment:

6 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 414 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equen	cies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		General		. +b:	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2 22	1560/1576	2 22	4 20	4 20	1 10	0 22
		w insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	2	1 4	2 1	1 1	0		1569/1576 1567/1576	2.33	4.29 3.88	4.30 4.27	4.46 4.35	2.33
		cor make clear estions reflect			0	0	1	3	1	1	•		1339/1342	2.33	3.88	4.27	4.35	2.33
	_	estions reflect ations reflect		_	0	0	2	3	1	0			1519/1520	1.83	3.79			1.83
				hat you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1			1386/1465	3.00	3.45	4.12	4.38	3.00
					0	2	1	1	2	0								
				what you learned	0	2	3	U T	1	0			1430/1434			4.14	4.30	2.25
		system clearly	-	.nea	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1545/1547 1/1574	1.50 5.00		4.19 4.64	4.24	1.50 5.00
		was class cance		ning effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	0			1/15/4	3.00	3.89		4.69	
9. HOW WO	uia you g.	rade the overa.	ii teaci	iing effectiveness	Т	2	U	U	3	U	U	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	3.89	4.10	4.24	3.00
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1438/1488	3.17	4.13	4.47	4.55	3.17
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	0	5		1053/1493	4.67		4.73	4.80	4.67
	s lecture material presented and explained clead the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	2	3	1	-		1449/1486	2.83	3.88		4.41	2.83
						0	2	2	0	2			1475/1489		3.91		4.38	2.33
			0	2	0	2	1	0			1149/1277							
3. 21a aa		occinii queb cin	ar aracrooming	Ü	_	Ü	_	_	Ü	_	3.00	1117,127.	3.00	3.05	1.05	1.01	5.00	
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	hat you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1153/1279	3.20	3.58	4.17	4.31	3.20	
2. Were a	ll studen	l to participate	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	3.62	4.35	4.53	3.00		
3. Did the	e instruc	l open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	3.67	4.35	4.55	3.00		
		Laborat	-															
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.92	4.20	4.19	4.00
F		Semina			_	0	•	0	2	-	0	2 05	045/ 255	2 05	2 1 1	4 01	2 00	2 05
5. Were c	riteria i	or grading made	e clear		2	0	0	0	3	1	U	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	3.17	4.01	3.90	3.25
		Field V	Jork															
5 Did co	nferences			eld activities	4	0	0	0	2	0	Ω	3.00	251/ 326	3 00	3 03	4 03	3 97	3 00
3. Dia co.	inerences	neip you carry	y Out 11	leid activities	-	U	U	U	2	U	U	3.00	231/ 320	3.00	3.03	1.03	3.91	3.00
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou			ne students	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.88	3.00
	. Were there enough proctors for all the students																	
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1											
a 11. =		Cum. GPA	1 . 1				_					_						
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				кеа	sons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors			
00-27								ed fo	r Ma	jors	;	0	Graduat	2	2	Majo	r	6
28-55										J						5		-
56-83							nera:	l				4	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0
84-150	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0												5				-	
Grad.							ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P 0												response				_	
	I 0						ner					3	_		3			
	I 0 ? 1																	

Course-Section: CMPE 491B 0101 University of Maryland Title INTO TO BIOMED SENSING Baltimore County

Instructor: KOSTOV, IORDAN Spring 2009

Enrollment: 7

Ouestionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 415 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 219/1576 4.83 4.29 4.30 4.46 4.83 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 2 1 2 1 3.33 1463/1576 3.33 3.88 4.27 4.35 3.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 899/1342 4.17 3.97 4.32 4.46 4.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 2 0 1 0 3 0 3.50 1362/1520 3.50 3.79 4.25 4.38 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 1456/1465 2.33 3.45 4.12 4.22 2.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 748/1434 4.20 3.71 4.14 4.30 4.207. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 2 1 3.50 1347/1547 3.50 3.66 4.19 4.24 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.84 4.64 4.69 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 2 1 3.67 1227/1554 3.67 3.89 4.10 4.24 3.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 666/1488 4.67 4.13 4.47 4.55 4.67 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 6 \quad 5.00$ 1/1493 5.00 4.51 4.73 4.80 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 678/1486 4.50 3.88 4.32 4.41 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 500/1489 4.67 3.91 4.32 4.38 4.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 0 3 2 3.83 839/1277 3.83 3.85 4.03 4.04 3.83 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1279 \*\*\*\* 3.58 4.17 4.31 \*\*\*\* 5 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1270 \*\*\*\* 3.62 4.35 4.53 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1269 \*\*\*\* 3.67 4.35 4.55 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 229/379 4.00 3.92 4.20 4.19 4.00 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 2 0 0 0 4 0 0 3.00 287/375 3.00 3.17 4.01 3.90 3.00 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 251/326 3.00 3.03 4.03 3.97 3.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons Type 00 - 270.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 1 Major в 3 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 C 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 General 4 Under-grad 5 Non-major 3.00-3.49 4 3.50-4.00 1 3 D 0 84-150 F 0 Electives Ω Grad. 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

т 0

Course-Section: CMPE 640 0101 Title

ADVANCED VLSI DESIGN

Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 416 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	•	0	0	0	0	-	_	4 00	100/1506	4 00	4 00	4 20	4 40	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	./	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	798/1576	4.38	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	735/1342	4.38	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1520	4.38	3.79	4.25	4.36	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	3		1028/1465	3.86	3.45	4.12	4.25	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	594/1434	4.33	3.71	4.14	4.35	4.33
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	805/1547	4.29	3.66	4.19	4.24	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.84	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1554	4.88	3.89	4.10	4.18	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.13	4.47	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.51	4.73	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	468/1486	4.67	3.88		4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	789/1489	4.43	3.91	4.32	4.38	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	974/1277	3.60	3.85	4.03	4.08	3.60
o. Dia addiovidudi occimitated cimanoc your anacidoanaing	_	_	_	_	Ü	Ü	J	3.00	3,1,12,,	3.00	3.00	1.05	1.00	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1279	4.83	3.58	4.17	4.34	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	3.62	4.35	4.53	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.83	3.67	4.35	4.55	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	2.71	4.05	4.11	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.22	4.23	4.36	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.50	4.01	4.35	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	133/ 229	4.50	4.02	4.51	4.51	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	103/ 232	4.50	4.08	4.29	4.47	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	77/ 379	4.50	3.92	4.20	4.37	
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	-	U	U	U	U	2	2	4.50	111 319	4.50	3.72	4.20	1.37	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.70	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	223/ 375	3.40	3.17	4.01	4.10	3.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.03	4.03	4.10	3.00
5. Did contenences help you carry out freed activities	4	U	U	U	7	U	U	3.00	Z31/ 3Z0	3.00	3.03	4.03	4.10	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	4.13	3.00

Course-Section: CMPE 640 0101

Title ADVANCED VLSI DESIGN

Instructor: PATEL, CHINTAN

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 416 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	 Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
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	4	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: CMPE 650 0101 DIGITAL SYSTEMS ROBUCCI, RYAN W

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 417

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Cou	urse Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General																		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1089/1576	4.10	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.10		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	0	3	3	4		1076/1576	4.10	3.88	4.27	4.32	4.10		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	709/1342	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.38	4.40		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	1	2	3			1041/1520	4.00	3.79	4.25	4.36	4.00		
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned			0	4	0	0	2	3	1		1043/1465	3.83	3.45	4.12	4.25	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned				0	5	0	0	2	2	1		1063/1434		3.71	4.14	4.35	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained				0	0	1	1	2	3			1303/1547	3.60	3.66	4.19		3.60	
	8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.84	4.64	4.75	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			2	1	0	0	5	2	0		1381/1554		3.89	4.10		3.29		
Lecture																		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1406/1488	3.40	4.13	4.47	4.52	3.40		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	6	4	0		1480/1493		4.51	4.73	4.80	3.40	
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	0	0	1	5	2			1330/1486	3.50	3.88	4.32	4.37	3.50	
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			0	0	1	1	3	4			1371/1489	3.30	3.91	4.32		3.30	
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	4	0	1	1	3			943/1277		3.85	4.03		3.67		
Discussion																		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			2	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1014/1279	3.63	3.58	4.17	4.34	3.63		
	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			2	0	0	1	3	2	2		1107/1270	3.63	3.62	4.35	4.53	3.63	
	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			2	0	0	1	2	3	2		1036/1269	3.75	3.67	4.35		3.75	
		hniques succe			2	6	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 878	***	2.71	4.05	4.11	****
Laboratory																		
1. Did the	e lab incre	ease understa	nding of t	the material	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	209/ 234	3.50	4.22	4.23	4.36	3.50
	2. Were you provided with adequate background information			6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	229/ 240	3.25	4.01	4.35	4.37	3.25	
3. Were ne	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities			6	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	222/ 229	3.50	4.02	4.51	4.51	3.50	
4. Did the	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance			6	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	222/ 232	3.00	4.08	4.29	4.47	3.00	
5. Were re	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified		2	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	367/ 379	3.25	3.92	4.20	4.37	3.25		
Field Work																		
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.03	4.03	4.10	****		
Self Paced																		
5. Were th	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	3.24	4.08	4.13	****		
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons				Ту	rpe		Majors				
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	 1	 A 7	Peguired fo			 or Ma	iore		0	Graduate		4	 or Ma	Major		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2	Required for Majors						•	Gradat	_	-	1100	-	9	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						1	Under-grad 6 N			Non-	Non-major		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		General							Under-grad 6 Non-major 1					_
Grad.								0 #### - Means there are not enough						rh				
91 di 0												-	responses to be significant					•
				= =		Oth	her					9	<u>.</u>					
				3 0														