```
Course-Section: CMPE 212  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  405
Title        PRIN OF DIGITAL DESIGN            Baltimore County                                JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   CASALE, DAVID                       Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    26
```

```
Questionnaires: 23                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General
1.	Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	1	16	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.35	4.57
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	3	6	9	3.90	1237/1576	3.90	3.88	4.27	4.32	3.90
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	2	3	9	4	3.43	1241/1342	3.43	3.97	4.32	4.41	3.43
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	3	3	2	5	7	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	3.79	4.25	4.26	3.50
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	2	1	7	3	2	3.13	1362/1465	3.13	3.45	4.12	4.09	3.13
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	3	5	1	6	3.35	1282/1434	3.35	3.71	4.14	4.06	3.35
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	3	1	4	10	3.85	1182/1547	3.85	3.66	4.19	4.22	3.85
8.	How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	567/1574	4.85	4.84	4.64	4.62	4.85
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	3	0	1	6	5	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	3.89	4.10	4.05	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
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	1	0	5	11	4.16	1387/1493	4.16	4.51	4.73	4.75	4.16
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	951/1486	4.26	3.88	4.32	4.29	4.26
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	4	13	4.47	731/1489	4.47	3.91	4.32	4.31	4.47
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/1277	****	3.85	4.03	4.01	****
Discussion
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	2	2	3	3	2.80	1224/1279	2.80	3.58	4.17	4.14	2.80
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	4	4	1	4	3.07	1203/1270	3.07	3.62	4.35	4.30	3.07
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	3	1	3	6	3.53	1107/1269	3.53	3.67	4.35	4.29	3.53
4.	Were special techniques successful	8	9	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	876/ 878	1.67	2.71	4.05	3.92	1.67
Laboratory
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.22	4.23	4.44	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.35	4.47	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 229	****	4.02	4.51	4.65	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 232	****	4.08	4.29	4.38	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	3.92	4.20	4.29	4.00
Seminar
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	3.17	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	3.03	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced
5.	Were there 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

```
                               Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Title   INTRO CIRCUIT THEORY   Baltimore County   JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.   Spring 2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	235/1576	4.81	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	279/1576	4.75	3.88	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	381/1342	4.69	3.97	4.32	4.30	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1153/1520	3.92	3.79	4.25	4.25	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	3.45	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	527/1547	4.50	3.66	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.84	4.64	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	138/1554	4.86	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.13	4.47	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.51	4.73	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	678/1486	4.50	3.88	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	474/1489	4.69	3.91	4.32	4.34	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	438/1277	4.36	3.85	4.03	4.11	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1279	****	3.58	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1270	****	3.62	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1269	****	3.67	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	2.71	4.05	4.09	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	147/ 234	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	141/ 240	4.29	4.01	4.35	4.32	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	194/ 229	4.14	4.02	4.51	4.48	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	139/ 232	4.29	4.08	4.29	4.16	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	210/ 379	4.09	3.92	4.20	4.17	4.09
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	254/ 375	3.20	3.17	4.01	4.12	3.20
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	3.03	4.03	4.23	3.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	250/ 382	3.33	3.24	4.08	4.24	3.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: CMPE 310  0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  407
Title         SYSTEMS DESIGN & PROG                  Baltimore County                                       JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   MOHAMMADPOURRAD                         Spring 2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
Questionnaires:  11                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  1  3  4  3  3.82 1316/1576  3.82  4.29  4.30  4.30  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  2  2  5  1  1  2.73 1554/1576  2.73  3.88  4.27  4.28  2.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  2  1  7  0  1  2.73 1325/1342  2.73  3.97  4.32  4.30  2.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  1  1  4  3  1  3.20 1449/1520  3.20  3.79  4.25  4.25  3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  3  2  5  1  3.36 1306/1465  3.36  3.45  4.12  4.09  3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  3  1  4  1  3.33 1289/1434  3.33  3.71  4.14  4.15  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  5  3  2  1  0  1.91 1541/1547  1.91  3.66  4.19  4.21  1.91
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  469/1574  4.91  4.84  4.64  4.61  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0  1  4  2  0  3.14 1420/1554  3.14  3.89  4.10  4.09  3.14

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  4  1  4  2  3.36 1413/1488  3.36  4.13  4.47  4.47  3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  2  3  3  3  3.64 1464/1493  3.64  4.51  4.73  4.70  3.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  4  4  1  1  2.73 1456/1486  2.73  3.88  4.32  4.32  2.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  2  1  4  2  2  3.09 1409/1489  3.09  3.91  4.32  4.34  3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 1  4  2  1  1  2.67 1219/1277  2.67  3.85  4.03  4.11  2.67

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0  0  0  3  0  0  3.00 1186/1279  3.00  3.58  4.17  4.20  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0  0  1  2  0  0  2.67 1243/1270  2.67  3.62  4.35  4.42  2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0  1  2  0  0  2.67 1244/1269  2.67  3.67  4.35  4.41  2.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 878  ****  2.71  4.05  4.09  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7  0  0  0  2  2  0  3.50  209/ 234  3.50  4.22  4.23  4.24  3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0  1  2  1  0  3.00  234/ 240  3.00  4.01  4.35  4.32  3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0 0  0  3  0  0  3.00  226/ 229  3.00  4.02  4.51  4.48  3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           8  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67  195/ 232  3.67  4.08  4.29  4.16  3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3  1  0  1  0  6  0  3.71  352/ 379  3.71  3.92  4.20  4.17  3.71

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.72  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  ****  4.64  4.53  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.61  4.22  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 4  0  0  1  5  1  0  3.00  287/ 375  3.00  3.17  4.01  4.12  3.00

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  9  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 326  ****  3.03  4.03  4.23  ****

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      9  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 382  ****  3.24  4.08  4.24  ****
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution
```

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

| I | 0 | Other | 10 |
| ? | 7 | | |

```
Course-Section: CMPE 314  0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  408
Title        PRIN OF ELECTRONIC CIR                  Baltimore County                                      JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  ROBUCCI, RYAN W                          Spring 2009                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires: 5                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                   Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20 1019/1576  4.20  4.29  4.30  4.30  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80 1292/1576  3.80  3.88  4.27  4.28  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5  0  4.00  972/1342  4.00  3.97  4.32  4.30  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1041/1520  4.00  3.79  4.25  4.25  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  647/1465  4.25  3.45  4.12  4.09  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 1142/1434  3.67  3.71  4.14  4.15  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  838/1547  4.25  3.66  4.19  4.21  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.84  4.64  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  4  1  0  3.20 1405/1554  3.20  3.89  4.10  4.09  3.20


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  3  1  1  0  2.60 1466/1486  2.60  3.88  4.32  4.32  2.60
4. Did the lectures 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  692/1277  4.00  3.85  4.03  4.11  4.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1279  ****  3.58  4.17  4.20  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1270  ****  3.62  4.35  4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1269  ****  3.67  4.35  4.41  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   4   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 878  ****  2.71  4.05  4.09  ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of 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 you provided with adequate background information 3 0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  198/ 240  4.00  4.01  4.35  4.32  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for 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 the lab instructor provide assistance            3   0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  165/ 232  4.00  4.08  4.29  4.16  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1   0  0  1  1  2  0  3.25  367/ 379  3.25  3.92  4.20  4.17  3.25


               Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  4   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 326  ****  3.03  4.03  4.23  ****


               Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      4   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 382  ****  3.24  4.08  4.24  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: CMPE 315  0101                University of Maryland                                Page  409
Title      PRIN VLSI DESIGN                       Baltimore County                                JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    PATEL, CHINTAN                      Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      14
Questionnaires:  12                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                   NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  1  2  9  4.67  415/1576  4.67  4.29  4.30  4.30  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected 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 exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  696/1342  4.42  3.97  4.32  4.30  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  3  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  167/1520  4.86  3.79  4.25  4.25  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to what 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 many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  813/1574  4.73  4.84  4.64  4.61  4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  0  3  6  4.67  263/1554  4.67  3.89  4.10  4.09  4.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  248/1488  4.91  4.13  4.47  4.47  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.51  4.73  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  6  6  4.50  678/1486  4.50  3.88  4.32  4.32  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  2  0  9  4.42  801/1489  4.42  3.91  4.32  4.34  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1277  5.00  3.85  4.03  4.11  5.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what 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 all students actively encouraged to 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0  1  1  2  4.25  819/1269  4.25  3.67  4.35  4.41  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  2  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 878  ****  2.71  4.05  4.09  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   50/ 234  4.67  4.22  4.23  4.24  4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 0 0 0  0  3  5.00    1/ 240  5.00  4.01  4.35  4.32  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab 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 lab instructor provide assistance           9  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/ 232  5.00  4.08  4.29  4.16  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43   99/ 379  4.43  3.92  4.20  4.17  4.43

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 326  ****  3.03  4.03  4.23  ****

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     4  0  0  0  3  5  0  3.63  206/ 382  3.63  3.24  4.08  4.24  3.63
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2      0.00-0.99   0       A    5        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major       12
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0       B    6                                                        
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99   4       C    1        General              1     Under-grad   12      Non-major    0
  84-150    5      3.00-3.49   1       D    0                                                        
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5       F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               11
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 320  0101                University of Maryland                          Page  410
Title         PROB, STAT, & RANDOM P            Baltimore County                            JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   PINKSTON, JOHN                      Spring 2009                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      24
Questionnaires:  19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  6 12  4.58  541/1576  4.58  4.29  4.30 4.30  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  6 12  4.58  515/1576  4.58  3.88  4.27 4.28  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  6 12  4.53  562/1342  4.53  3.97  4.32 4.30  4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   9  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  805/1520  4.30  3.79  4.25 4.25  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  1  9  2  5  3.50 1242/1465  3.50  3.45  4.12 4.09  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  6 1  0  1  4  7  4.23  704/1434  4.23  3.71  4.14 4.15  4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  4  7  8  4.21  882/1547  4.21  3.66  4.19 4.21  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.84  4.64 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  2  8  8  4.33  623/1554  4.33  3.89  4.10 4.09  4.33

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  3 16  4.84  339/1488  4.84  4.13  4.47 4.47  4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  3 16  4.84  708/1493  4.84  4.51  4.73 4.70  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  9  9  4.42  792/1486  4.42  3.88  4.32 4.32  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  2 15  4.68  474/1489  4.68  3.91  4.32 4.34  4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 7  0  2  1  6  3  3.83  839/1277  3.83  3.85  4.03 4.11  3.83

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1279  ****  3.58  4.17 4.20  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1270  ****  3.62  4.35 4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1269  ****  3.67  4.35 4.41  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  18   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 878  ****  2.71  4.05 4.09  ****

                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14   0  0  0  0  5  0  4.00  229/ 379  4.00  3.92  4.20 4.17  4.00

                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14   0  0  0  4  1  0  3.20  254/ 375  3.20  3.17  4.01 4.12  3.20

                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12   0  0  0  6  1  0  3.14  237/ 326  3.14  3.03  4.03 4.23  3.14

                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     13   0  0  0  6  0  0  3.00  313/ 382  3.00  3.24  4.08 4.24  3.00
```

```
                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27    0      0.00-0.99    0      A   7      Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0      Major      18
28-55    0      1.00-1.99    0      B   7                                                   
56-83    1      2.00-2.99    0      C   2      General              0    Under-grad  19     Non-major   1
84-150   9      3.00-3.49    6      D   0
Grad.    0      3.50-4.00    5      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                    P   0                               responses to be significant
                                    I   0      Other               18
                                    ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 330  0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  411
Title        EM WAVES TRANSMISSION                     Baltimore County                                    JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  CASALE, DAVID A                           Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 17                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                     NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   1   2   3   9   2  3.53 1438/1576  3.53  4.29  4.30  4.30  3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   2   7   5   3  3.53 1387/1576  3.53  3.88  4.27  4.28  3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   6   8   3  3.82 1101/1342  3.82  3.97  4.32  4.30  3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   1   4   7   5   0  2.94 1479/1520  2.94  3.79  4.25  4.25  2.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   3   1   1   4   5   2  3.46 1262/1465  3.46  3.45  4.12  4.09  3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   6   1   4   6   0  2.59 1412/1434  2.59  3.71  4.14  4.15  2.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   1   2   2   8   4  3.71 1259/1547  3.71  3.66  4.19  4.21  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0  17  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.84  4.64  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   1   2   8   5   0  3.06 1437/1554  3.06  3.89  4.10  4.09  3.06


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   2   4  10   0  3.50 1388/1488  3.50  4.13  4.47  4.47  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   3   2   6   5  3.81 1449/1493  3.81  4.51  4.73  4.70  3.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   1   4   5   6   0  3.00 1421/1486  3.00  3.88  4.32  4.32  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   2   3   7   3   1  2.88 1443/1489  2.88  3.91  4.32  4.34  2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 14   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/1277  ****  3.85  4.03  4.11  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1279  ****  3.58  4.17  4.20  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1270  ****  3.62  4.35  4.42  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1269  ****  3.67  4.35  4.41  ****


             Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13  0   0   0   0   2   2  4.50 ****/ 379  ****  3.92  4.20  4.17  ****


             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 13  0   0   0   3   1   0  3.25 ****/ 375  ****  3.17  4.01  4.12  ****


             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  15  0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 326  ****  3.03  4.03  4.23  ****


             Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      11  0   0   0   4   2   0  3.33  250/ 382  3.33  3.24  4.08  4.24  3.33

                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0       A   7          Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0        Major      14
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0       B   6
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99   1       C   2          General              3      Under-grad  17        Non-major   3
  84-150    8       3.00-3.49   6       D   0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   6       F   0          Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                        I   0          Other               12
                                        ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 422  0101                    University of Maryland                                  Page  412
Title      DIGITAL SIGNAL PROCESS                  Baltimore County                                       JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   LABERGE, E.F.                        Spring 2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  18                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  6 12  4.67  415/1576  4.67  4.29  4.30  4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  8 10  4.56  542/1576  4.56  3.88  4.27  4.35  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  2  2 14  4.67  406/1342  4.67  3.97  4.32  4.46  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   2  0  0  2  2 12  4.63  376/1520  4.63  3.79  4.25  4.38  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  7 10  4.50  527/1547  4.50  3.66  4.19  4.24  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0 10  7  4.41 1189/1574  4.41  4.84  4.64  4.69  4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  0  0  6 12  4.67  666/1488  4.67  4.13  4.47  4.55  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0 18  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  1  9  8  4.39  841/1486  4.39  3.88  4.32  4.41  4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  0  1  6 11  4.56  637/1489  4.56  3.91  4.32  4.38  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your 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 criteria for grading made clear              17   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 375  ****  3.17  4.01  3.90  ****


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  17   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 326  ****  3.03  4.03  3.97  ****


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students   13   0  0  0  2  3  0  3.60  208/ 382  3.60  3.24  4.08  3.88  3.60

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons              Type                  Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0      A   9        Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0       Major       18
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0      B   6
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    2      C   2        General               9     Under-grad  18       Non-major    0
  84-150    6        3.00-3.49    5      D   0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    6      F   0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                10
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 451  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page  413
Title      CAPSTONE II                             Baltimore County                                  JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  PINKSTON, JOHN                            Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
```
```
Questionnaires:  25                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  5 19  4.72  347/1576  4.72  4.29  4.30  4.46  4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  2  1  5  5 12  3.96 1177/1576  3.96  3.88  4.27  4.35  3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  17  1  0  1  2  4  4.00  972/1342  4.00  3.97  4.32  4.46  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  3  2  6 13  4.21  913/1520  4.21  3.79  4.25  4.38  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  16  0  2  2  2  2  3.50 1242/1465  3.50  3.45  4.12  4.22  3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4  2  0  2  9  8  4.00  878/1434  4.00  3.71  4.14  4.30  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   5  4  2  8  0  6  3.10 1449/1547  3.10  3.66  4.19  4.24  3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  2  0  1  0 21  4.58 1018/1574  4.58  4.84  4.64  4.69  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching 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 instructor'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
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  1  6 12  4.58 1150/1493  4.58  4.51  4.73  4.80  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7   0  0  0  1  7 10  4.50  678/1486  4.50  3.88  4.32  4.41  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      7   0  2  1  6  4  5  3.50 1313/1489  3.50  3.91  4.32  4.38  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  7  0  1  2  3  4  4.00  692/1277  4.00  3.85  4.03  4.04  4.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1279  ****  3.58  4.17  4.31  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 22  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1270  ****  3.62  4.35  4.53  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1269  ****  3.67  4.35  4.55  ****


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   24  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 234  ****  4.22  4.23  4.28  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  4.01  4.35  4.45  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 229  ****  4.02  4.51  4.70  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            24  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.08  4.29  4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly 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                 20  0  0  0  5  0  0  3.00 ****/ 375  ****  3.17  4.01  3.90  ****


                Field Work
5. Did conferences 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 enough proctors for all the students      15  0  0  0  8  1  1  3.30  257/ 382  3.30  3.24  4.08  3.88  3.30


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     3       0.00-0.99   0      A   15        Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major       25
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0      B    5
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99   2      C    1        General              0     Under-grad   25      Non-major    0
  84-150    7       3.00-3.49  12      D    0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   6      F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               24
                                       ?    2
```

```
Enrollment:    6
Questionnaires: 6                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1569/1576	2.33	4.29	4.30	4.46	2.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	2.50	1567/1576	2.50	3.88	4.27	4.35	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1339/1342	2.33	3.97	4.32	4.46	2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	1.83	1519/1520	1.83	3.79	4.25	4.38	1.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	3.45	4.12	4.22	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1430/1434	2.25	3.71	4.14	4.30	2.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1545/1547	1.50	3.66	4.19	4.24	1.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	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	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	3.89	4.10	4.24	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1438/1488	3.17	4.13	4.47	4.55	3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.51	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1449/1486	2.83	3.88	4.32	4.41	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	1475/1489	2.33	3.91	4.32	4.38	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.85	4.03	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what 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 all students actively encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	3.67	4.35	4.55	3.00
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	3	1	0	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	3.17	4.01	3.90	3.25
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
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	313/ 382	3.00	3.24	4.08	3.88	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: CMPE 491B 0101                   University of Maryland                                    Page  415
Title      INTO TO BIOMED SENSING                    Baltimore County                                      JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    KOSTOV, IORDAN                          Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    7
Questionnaires:  6                              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                   Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                       NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank        Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  0  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  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  4.20
7. 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  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  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   0  0  0  0  0  6  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  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1270  ****  3.62  4.35  4.53  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 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          Reasons                  Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0        A    3        Required for Majors  1        Graduate      1        Major        4
 28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B    3
 56-83     0      2.00-2.99   1        C    0        General              4        Under-grad    5        Non-major    2
 84-150    3      3.00-3.49   4        D    0
 Grad.     1      3.50-4.00   1        F    0        Electives            0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                3
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: CMPE 640  0101                   University of Maryland                                  Page  416
Title       ADVANCED VLSI DESIGN                   Baltimore County                                     JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  PATEL, CHINTAN                          Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  8                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   1   7  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  3.86 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
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             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  4.32  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

              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  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  4.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.40  4.76  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.73  4.88  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    7   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  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

              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
```

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   1   Required for Majors 0   Graduate   6   Major   8
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   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 significant
                                         I   0   Other   7
                                         ?   1

```
Course-Section: CMPE 650  0101                 University of Maryland                                      Page  417
Title       DIGITAL SYSTEMS                     Baltimore County                                          JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  ROBUCCI, RYAN W                    Spring 2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  10                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                     NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   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  4.10 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   4  4.00 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  3.83 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  3.80 1063/1434  3.80  3.71  4.14 4.35  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   2   3   3  3.60 1303/1547  3.60  3.66  4.19 4.24  3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2   8  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  3.29 1381/1554  3.29  3.89  4.10 4.18  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  3.40 1480/1493  3.40  4.51  4.73 4.80  3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   1   5   2   2  3.50 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   1  3.30 1371/1489  3.30  3.91  4.32 4.38  3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   4   0   1   1   3   1  3.67  943/1277  3.67  3.85  4.03 4.08  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  3.63 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  3.75 1036/1269  3.75  3.67  4.35 4.55  3.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   6   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 ****/ 878  ****  2.71  4.05 4.11  ****

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of 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 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 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 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 there enough proctors for all the students     8   0   0   0   2   0   0  3.00 ****/ 382  ****  3.24  4.08 4.13  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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