```
Course Section: ENEE 302  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  678
Title          PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN       Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    BOURNER, DAVID             Fall  2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       9
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  1  0  3  2  4.00 1173/1669   4.00  4.26  4.23 4.28  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  1  0  4  1  3.83 1288/1666   4.00  4.13  4.19 4.20  3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1  0  0  5  0  3.50 1222/1421   3.62  4.01  4.24 4.25  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   1  0  1  4  0  3.40 1425/1617   3.69  4.02  4.15 4.22  3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   1  0  1  2  1  3.40 1303/1555   3.83  4.02  4.00 4.03  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  1  3  1  3.50 1260/1543   3.62  4.11  4.06 4.14  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  1  0  3  2  4.00 1043/1647   3.72  4.18  4.12 4.14  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  0  2  4  4.67 1068/1668   4.77  4.75  4.67 4.68  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  1  1  3  1  3.67 1274/1605   3.61  3.92  4.07 4.09  3.67

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1514   4.80  4.57  4.39 4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  0  0  2  4  4.67 1028/1551   4.77  4.65  4.66 4.70  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  0  0  3  3  4.50  556/1503   4.09  4.26  4.24 4.28  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  1  2  3  4.33  838/1506   4.00  4.23  4.26 4.30  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  1  0  0  3  2  3.83  744/1311   3.56  3.93  3.85 3.97  3.83

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0  0  1  1  0  3.50 1154/1490   3.50  3.96  4.05 4.11  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0  0  0  1  1  4.50  632/1502   3.88  4.26  4.26 4.28  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  684/1489   4.50  4.38  4.29 4.35  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1006   ****  4.17  4.00 4.10  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  1   0   2  0  0  2  1  3.00  212/ 226   3.57  4.04  4.20 4.17  3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0  0  1  2  2  0  3.20  217/ 233   3.54  4.03  4.19 4.13  3.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0  1  0  1  2  1  3.40  220/ 225   4.14  4.42  4.50 4.45  3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1   0   0  1  2  1  1  3.40  206/ 223   4.00  4.34  4.35 4.27  3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1   0   1  1  0  2  1  3.20  183/ 206   3.72  4.14  4.15 4.08  3.20

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5  0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 112   ****  4.78  4.38 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97   ****  5.00  4.36 4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5  0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  92   ****  5.00  4.22 4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 105   ****  4.78  4.20 4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  98   ****  5.00  3.95 4.15  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  58   ****  5.00  4.22 4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  52   ****  5.00  4.06 3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39   ****  5.00  4.39 3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  40   ****  5.00  3.97 3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  30   ****  5.00  4.33 3.49  ****

                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4  0   1  0  0  1  0  2.50   53/  55   2.50  3.90  4.34 4.03  2.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    5   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  42   ****  4.25  4.31 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  46   ****  4.13  4.45 4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  33   ****  4.25  4.25 3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     5   0   0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  29   ****  5.00  4.34 4.13  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 302  0102                University of Maryland                          Page  679
Title         PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN            Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   BOURNER, DAVID                       Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      20
Questionnaires: 15                        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  3  6  6  4.20  988/1669  4.00  4.26  4.23  4.28  4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  0  7  7  4.33  777/1666  4.00  4.13  4.19  4.20  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  2  3  4  5  3.67 1166/1421  3.62  4.01  4.24  4.25  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  3  0  0  4  5  3  3.92 1154/1617  3.69  4.02  4.15  4.22  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  541/1555  3.83  4.02  4.00  4.03  4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  0  1  6  5  4.08  850/1543  3.62  4.11  4.06  4.14  4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  2  1  2  4  6  3.73 1285/1647  3.72  4.18  4.12  4.14  3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  2 13  4.87  788/1668  4.77  4.75  4.67  4.68  4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  1  1  7  4  4.08  871/1605  3.61  3.92  4.07  4.09  4.08

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  0  0  2 12  4.60  679/1514  4.80  4.57  4.39  4.46  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  358/1551  4.77  4.65  4.66  4.70  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  0  1  7  5  4.07 1030/1503  4.09  4.26  4.24  4.28  4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  1  0  1  6  7  4.20  958/1506  4.00  4.23  4.26  4.30  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4  0  1  4  2  3  3.70  818/1311  3.56  3.93  3.85  3.97  3.70

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12  0  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/1490  3.50  3.96  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0  1  1  0  0  2  3.25 1371/1502  3.88  4.26  4.26  4.28  3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12  0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1489  4.50  4.38  4.29  4.35  ****

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   9  0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83  166/ 226  3.57  4.04  4.20  4.17  3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9  0  1  0  2  1  2  3.50  203/ 233  3.54  4.03  4.19  4.13  3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  0  1  0  0  1  4  4.17  170/ 225  4.14  4.42  4.50  4.45  4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            9  0  0  2  1  1  2  3.50  200/ 223  4.00  4.34  4.35  4.27  3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9  0  1  1  1  0  3  3.50  169/ 206  3.72  4.14  4.15  4.08  3.50

                                 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        0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0       B    5
 56-83      1        2.00-2.99   2       C    3        General              0    Under-grad   15     Non-major   15
 84-150     8        3.00-3.49   5       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               14
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENEE 302  0103               University of Maryland                          Page  680
Title          PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN          Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    BOURNER, DAVID                   Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     22
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  4  4  2 3.80 1352/1669  4.00  4.26  4.23  4.28  3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  4  5  1 3.70 1358/1666  4.00  4.13  4.19  4.20  3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  3  2  5  0 3.20 1319/1421  3.62  4.01  4.24  4.25  3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  0  5  4  0 3.44 1403/1617  3.69  4.02  4.15  4.22  3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4  0  0  3  2  1 3.67 1133/1555  3.83  4.02  4.00  4.03  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0  2  5  0  2 3.22 1352/1543  3.62  4.11  4.06  4.14  3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  2  4  2  2 3.40 1440/1647  3.72  4.18  4.12  4.14  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  2  8 4.80  901/1668  4.77  4.75  4.67  4.68  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  8  2  0 3.20 1470/1605  3.61  3.92  4.07  4.09  3.20

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  4  6 4.60  679/1514  4.80  4.57  4.39  4.46  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  4  6 4.60 1111/1551  4.77  4.65  4.66  4.70  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0  1  2  5  1 3.67 1277/1503  4.09  4.26  4.24  4.28  3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  1  4  3  2 3.60 1300/1506  4.00  4.23  4.26  4.30  3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 2 1  3  0  4 3.30 1042/1311  3.56  3.93  3.85  3.97  3.30

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1490  3.50  3.96  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1502  3.88  4.26  4.26  4.28  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1489  4.50  4.38  4.29  4.35  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3  0  0  1  2  4  0 3.43  200/ 226  3.57  4.04  4.20  4.17  3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0  1  3  3  0 3.29  213/ 233  3.54  4.03  4.19  4.13  3.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0  0  2  2  3 4.14  173/ 225  4.14  4.42  4.50  4.45  4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3  0  0  0  0  5  2 4.29  143/ 223  4.00  4.34  4.35  4.27  4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3  0  0  1  1  2  3 4.00  117/ 206  3.72  4.14  4.15  4.08  4.00

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0        A    2        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0      Major       0
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B    3
 56-83      4        2.00-2.99   0        C    4        General              0    Under-grad   10      Non-major  10
 84-150     3        3.00-3.49   3        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                9
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course Section: ENEE 302  0104          University of Maryland                              Page  681
Title          PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN         Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    BOURNER, DAVID                   Fall   2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    16
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	1	1	3	3	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1019/1666	4.00	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	916/1421	3.62	4.01	4.24	4.25	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1617	3.69	4.02	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	773/1555	3.83	4.02	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1195/1543	3.62	4.11	4.06	4.14	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1275/1647	3.72	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.61	3.92	4.07	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	4.80	4.57	4.39	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.77	4.65	4.66	4.70	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	996/1503	4.09	4.26	4.24	4.28	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1189/1506	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.30	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	995/1311	3.56	3.93	3.85	3.97	3.40
Discussion														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1502	3.88	4.26	4.26	4.28	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	140/ 226	3.57	4.04	4.20	4.17	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	127/ 233	3.54	4.03	4.19	4.13	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	68/ 225	4.14	4.42	4.50	4.45	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	55/ 223	4.00	4.34	4.35	4.27	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	110/ 206	3.72	4.14	4.15	4.08	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 601  0101          University of Maryland                           Page  682
Title        LINEAR SYS THY              Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MORRIS, JOEL    (Instr. A)       Fall  2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 14                       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  0  2  7  4  3.93 1265/1669  3.93  4.26  4.23 4.35  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  4  1  7  3.86 1273/1666  3.86  4.13  4.19 4.19  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  4  1  8  4.14  901/1421  4.14  4.01  4.24 4.33  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  4  4  5  3.86 1196/1617  3.86  4.02  4.15 4.24  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  3  4  7  4.29  533/1555  4.29  4.02  4.00 4.07  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  2  3  8  4.21  700/1543  4.21  4.11  4.06 4.27  4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  2  2  3  2  5  3.43 1430/1647  3.43  4.18  4.12 4.15  3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  3  8  3  4.00 1530/1668  4.00  4.75  4.67 4.83  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  1  0  3  3  2  3.56 1334/1605  3.56  3.92  4.07 4.13  3.56

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  2  0  6  2  4  3.43 1403/1514  3.43  4.57  4.39 4.37  3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  0  2  5  6  4.07 1394/1551  3.79  4.65  4.66 4.72  3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  1  6  1  5  3.57 1309/1503  3.57  4.26  4.24 4.22  3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  2  2  5  2  3  3.14 1392/1506  3.14  4.23  4.26 4.24  3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  3  1  5  2  1  2.75 1195/1311  2.75  3.93  3.85 3.89  2.75

               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  2  1  2  1  5  3.55 1139/1490  3.55  3.96  4.05 4.18  3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  595/1502  4.55  4.26  4.26 4.46  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  2  1  9  4.58  613/1489  4.58  4.38  4.29 4.44  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1  0  0  2  1  7  4.50  235/1006  4.50  4.17  4.00 4.11  4.50

               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9   4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 226  ****  4.04  4.20 4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.03  4.19 4.41  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.42  4.50 4.65  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  4.34  4.35 4.48  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 206  ****  4.14  4.15 4.39  ****

               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9  2  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/ 112  ****  4.78  4.38 4.39  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/  97  ****  5.00  4.36 4.38  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 2  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  92  ****  5.00  4.22 4.36  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    11   1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.78  4.20 4.23  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                11   1  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/  98  ****  5.00  3.95 3.93  ****

               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  0  0  2  3.67 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.53  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 4.57  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.90  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 4.31  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11   1  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33 4.55  ****

               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50   43/  55  3.50  3.90  4.34 4.45  3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    10   0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50   31/  42  3.50  4.25  4.31 4.40  3.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      10   0  1  0  1  1  1  3.25   42/  46  3.25  4.13  4.45 4.61  3.25
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       10   0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50   25/  33  3.50  4.25  4.25 4.60  3.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34 5.00  ****
```

Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL   (Instr. A)   Fall   2006   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   2   0.00-0.99   1   A   8   Required for Majors   0   Graduate   5   Major   11
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   2
 56-83   0   2.00-2.99   0   C   0   General   0   Under-grad   9   Non-major   3
 84-150   0   3.00-3.49   0   D   0
 Grad.   5   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   11
                                           ?   0

```
Course Section: ENEE 601  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  683
Title       LINEAR SYS THY                    Baltimore County                                       JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:               (Instr. D)            Fall  2006                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     20
Questionnaires: 14                         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  0  2  7  4 3.93 1265/1669  3.93  4.26  4.23 4.35  3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  1  4  1  7 3.86 1273/1666  3.86  4.13  4.19 4.19  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  4  1  8 4.14  901/1421  4.14  4.01  4.24 4.33  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  1  0  4  4  5 3.86 1196/1617  3.86  4.02  4.15 4.24  3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  3  4  7 4.29  533/1555  4.29  4.02  4.00 4.07  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  2  3  8 4.21  700/1543  4.21  4.11  4.06 4.27  4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  2  2  3  2  5 3.43 1430/1647  3.43  4.18  4.12 4.15  3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  3  8  3 4.00 1530/1668  4.00  4.75  4.67 4.83  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        13   0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1514  3.43  4.57  4.39 4.37  3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   13   0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/1551  3.79  4.65  4.66 4.72  3.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1503  3.57  4.26  4.24 4.22  3.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     13   0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1506  3.14  4.23  4.26 4.24  3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/1311  2.75  3.93  3.85 3.89  2.75


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  2  1  2  1  5 3.55 1139/1490  3.55  3.96  4.05 4.18  3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  1  3  7 4.55  595/1502  4.55  4.26  4.26 4.46  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  2  1  9 4.58  613/1489  4.58  4.38  4.29 4.44  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                   3  1  0  0  2  1  7 4.50  235/1006  4.50  4.17  4.00 4.11  4.50


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   9  4  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 226  ****  4.04  4.20 4.47  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0  0  1  1  1 4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.03  4.19 4.41  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 1 1  0  0  0  1 3.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.42  4.50 4.65  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            11 2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 223  ****  4.34  4.35 4.48  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  11 2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 206  ****  4.14  4.15 4.39  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9  2  0  0  1  0  2 4.33 ****/ 112  ****  4.78  4.38 4.39  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0  0  0  1  2 4.67 ****/  97  ****  5.00  4.36 4.38  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 2  0  0  0  0  2 5.00 ****/  92  ****  5.00  4.22 4.36  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     11 1  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 105  ****  4.78  4.20 4.23  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 11 1  0  1  0  0  1 3.50 ****/  98  ****  5.00  3.95 3.93  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  11 0  1  0  0  0  2 3.67 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.53  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  11 0  0  0  1  1  1 4.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 4.57  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        11 0  0  0  1  0  2 4.33 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.90  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    11 0  0  0  1  0  2 4.33 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 4.31  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  11 1  0  0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/  30  ****  5.00  4.33 4.55  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0  1  0  1  0  2 3.50   43/  55  3.50  3.90  4.34 4.45  3.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     10 0  1  0  1  0  2 3.50   31/  42  3.50  4.25  4.31 4.40  3.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       10 0  1  0  1  1  1 3.25   42/  46  3.25  4.13  4.45 4.61  3.25
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        10 0  1  0  1  0  2 3.50   25/  33  3.50  4.25  4.25 4.60  3.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      11 0  0  0  1  0  2 4.33 ****/  29  ****  5.00  4.34 5.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: ENEE 608  0101              University of Maryland                    Page  684
Title        GRADUATE SEMINAR                 Baltimore County                       JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ADALI, TULAY                     Fall   2006                            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  1  0  2  3  5  4.00 1173/1669  4.00  4.26  4.23  4.35  4.00
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  2  6  2  3.73 1348/1666  3.73  4.13  4.19  4.19  3.73
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   7  1  0  2  0  0  2.33 1414/1421  2.33  4.01  4.24  4.33  2.33
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   8  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1301/1617  3.67  4.02  4.15  4.24  3.67
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   9  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1555  ****  4.02  4.00  4.07  ****
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1543  ****  4.11  4.06  4.27  ****
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   9  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/1647  ****  4.18  4.12  4.15  ****
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  1  0  0  2  7  4.40 1274/1668  4.40  4.75  4.67  4.83  4.40
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  654/1605  4.29  3.92  4.07  4.13  4.29

              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  1  0  1  6  4.50  799/1514  4.50  4.57  4.39  4.37  4.50
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  1  0  1  6  4.50 1193/1551  4.50  4.65  4.66  4.72  4.50
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  0  0  1  6  4.38  753/1503  4.38  4.26  4.24  4.22  4.38
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   2  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  575/1506  4.57  4.23  4.26  4.24  4.57
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  104/1311  4.83  3.93  3.85  3.89  4.83

              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  667/1490  4.29  3.96  4.05  4.18  4.29
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  859/1502  4.29  4.26  4.26  4.46  4.29
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  622/1489  4.57  4.38  4.29  4.44  4.57
 4. Were special techniques successful                  4   4  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  479/1006  4.00  4.17  4.00  4.11  4.00

              Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7  1  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   78/ 112  4.33  4.78  4.38  4.39  4.33
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  97  ****  5.00  4.36  4.38  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  92  ****  5.00  4.22  4.36  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   59/ 105  4.33  4.78  4.20  4.23  4.33
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8   2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  98  ****  5.00  3.95  3.93  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4      0.00-0.99    2      A   1       Required for Majors  3    Graduate     4     Major      10
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   0                                                                
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C   0       General              0    Under-grad   7     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   8                                responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                7
                                       ?   2
```

```
Course Section: ENEE 612  0101          University of Maryland                        Page  685
Title       DIGITAL IMAGE PROCESSI          Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  GUILFOYLE, KERR                  Fall  2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     10
Questionnaires:  9                    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  5 4.56  534/1669  4.56  4.26  4.23  4.35  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  4  4 4.33  777/1666  4.33  4.13  4.19  4.19  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  6  2  1 3.44 1256/1421  3.44  4.01  4.24  4.33  3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  1  3  3  2 3.67 1301/1617  3.67  4.02  4.15  4.24  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  3  5 4.44  398/1555  4.44  4.02  4.00  4.07  4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  1  6 4.44  465/1543  4.44  4.11  4.06  4.27  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  4  4 4.33  759/1647  4.33  4.18  4.12  4.15  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  3  6 4.67 1068/1668  4.67  4.75  4.67  4.83  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  1  0  0  2  3  0 3.60 1312/1605  3.60  3.92  4.07  4.13  3.60

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  1  3  5 4.44  892/1514  4.44  4.57  4.39  4.37  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  1  3  5 4.44 1239/1551  4.44  4.65  4.66  4.72  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  2  2  5 4.33  800/1503  4.33  4.26  4.24  4.22  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  2  3  4 4.22  934/1506  4.22  4.23  4.26  4.24  4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  3  1  3 4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.93  3.85  3.89  4.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  1  1  2  2 3.43 1202/1490  3.43  3.96  4.05  4.18  3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  1  1  3  2 3.86 1148/1502  3.86  4.26  4.26  4.46  3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  2  2  3 4.14  986/1489  4.14  4.38  4.29  4.44  4.14
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  2  1  1  2  0  1 2.80  952/1006  2.80  4.17  4.00  4.11  2.80
```

```
                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 620  0101          University of Maryland                        Page  686
Title         PROB RANDOM PROC          Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   ADALI, TULAY              Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       16
Questionnaires: 12                  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	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.35	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1288/1666	3.83	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	1	2	5	3.67	1166/1421	3.67	4.01	4.24	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1334/1617	3.60	4.02	4.15	4.24	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	721/1555	4.08	4.02	4.00	4.07	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1160/1543	3.73	4.11	4.06	4.27	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.75	4.67	4.83	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1116/1605	3.88	3.92	4.07	4.13	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1111/1551	4.60	4.65	4.66	4.72	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.26	4.24	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	731/1311	3.86	3.93	3.85	3.89	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1154/1490	3.50	3.96	4.05	4.18	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1106/1502	3.92	4.26	4.26	4.46	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	960/1489	4.18	4.38	4.29	4.44	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	923/1006	3.00	4.17	4.00	4.11	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.04	4.20	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.03	4.19	4.41	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.42	4.50	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.14	4.15	4.39	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	4.78	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.78	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	3.95	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	4.31	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	4.25	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.13	4.45	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 33	****	4.25	4.25	4.60	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 623  0101                University of Maryland                        Page  687
Title        COMMUN THEORY I                     Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  THOMAS, JOSEPH                        Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     4
Questionnaires:  3                        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   2  4.67  389/1669  4.67  4.26  4.23  4.35  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  359/1666  4.67  4.13  4.19  4.19  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.01  4.24  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33  717/1617  4.33  4.02  4.15  4.24  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  225/1555  4.67  4.02  4.00  4.07  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1543  5.00  4.11  4.06  4.27  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  302/1647  4.67  4.18  4.12  4.15  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1605  5.00  3.92  4.07  4.13  5.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1514  5.00  4.57  4.39  4.37  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.65  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1503  5.00  4.26  4.24  4.22  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1506  5.00  4.23  4.26  4.24  5.00


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 635  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  688
Title      INTRO OPTICAL COMM             Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    CHEN, YUNG JUI             Fall   2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      8
Questionnaires:  7                    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   3   3  4.29  876/1669  4.29  4.26  4.23  4.35  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   0   2   4  4.29  841/1666  4.29  4.13  4.19  4.19  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   5   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1421  ****  4.01  4.24  4.33  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2   0   0   0   3   2  4.40  641/1617  4.40  4.02  4.15  4.24  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2   0   0   1   1   2  4.25  558/1555  4.25  4.02  4.00  4.07  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  580/1543  4.33  4.11  4.06  4.27  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   1   1   1   3  4.00 1043/1647  4.00  4.18  4.12  4.15  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40  499/1605  4.40  3.92  4.07  4.13  4.40

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57  715/1514  4.57  4.57  4.39  4.37  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.65  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57  491/1503  4.57  4.26  4.24  4.22  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  744/1506  4.43  4.23  4.26  4.24  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   1   1   0   1   4  3.86  731/1311  3.86  3.93  3.85  3.89  3.86

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   1   5   1  4.00  849/1490  4.00  3.96  4.05  4.18  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  438/1502  4.71  4.26  4.26  4.46  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57  622/1489  4.57  4.38  4.29  4.44  4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   6   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1006  ****  4.17  4.00  4.11  ****

                                Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 660  8010                    University of Maryland                            Page  689
Title       SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES                  Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   HOCH, PETER                              Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
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  4  9  5  4.06 1138/1669  4.06  4.26  4.23  4.35  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  7  6  5  3.89 1250/1666  3.89  4.13  4.19  4.19  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  2  1 11  4  3.94 1024/1421  3.94  4.01  4.24  4.33  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  4 11  3  3.94 1112/1617  3.94  4.02  4.15  4.24  3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  2  3  7  3  3  3.11 1410/1555  3.11  4.02  4.00  4.07  3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 3 7 7  4.11  819/1543  4.11  4.11  4.06  4.27  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  2 10  6  4.22  896/1647  4.22  4.18  4.12  4.15  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  4 13  4.76  952/1668  4.76  4.75  4.67  4.83  4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 3 6 4  4.08  871/1605  4.08  3.92  4.07  4.13  4.08

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  0  1  2  7  8  4.22 1100/1514  4.22  4.57  4.39  4.37  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.65  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  1  4  9  4  3.89 1176/1503  3.89  4.26  4.24  4.22  3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  0  2  3  8  5  3.89 1184/1506  3.89  4.23  4.26  4.24  3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1 3 8 5  4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.93  3.85  3.89  4.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 5 7 2 1  2.81 1393/1490  2.81  3.96  4.05  4.18  2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 2 6 2 4 4  3.11 1390/1502  3.11  4.26  4.26  4.46  3.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 1 7 4 5 1  2.89 1431/1489  2.89  4.38  4.29  4.44  2.89
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  15  2  1  0  0  0  1.33 ****/1006  ****  4.17  4.00  4.11  ****

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.03  4.19  4.41  ****
```

                          Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     3        0.00-0.99    1        A   14          Required for Majors   1     Graduate     12       Major       4
28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0        B    3                                      Under-grad    6       Non-major  14
56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0        C    0          General               3
84-150    0        3.00-3.49    1        D    0                                      #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.    12        3.50-4.00    2        F    0          Electives             3            responses to be significant
                                         P    0
                                         I    0          Other                12
                                         ?    0
```

```
Enrollment:     18
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	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1014/1669	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.35	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	9	4	3.94	1192/1666	3.94	4.13	4.19	4.19	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	4	3.94	1024/1421	3.94	4.01	4.24	4.33	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	11	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.02	4.15	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	6	4	3.47	1249/1555	3.47	4.02	4.00	4.07	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	7	5	3.94	981/1543	3.94	4.11	4.06	4.27	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	885/1647	4.24	4.18	4.12	4.15	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	1	3.85	1140/1605	3.79	3.92	4.07	4.13	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	703/1514	4.59	4.57	4.39	4.37	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	862/1551	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.72	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	896/1503	4.20	4.26	4.24	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	680/1506	4.39	4.23	4.26	4.24	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	557/1311	4.17	3.93	3.85	3.89	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	800/1490	4.12	3.96	4.05	4.18	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	668/1502	4.47	4.26	4.26	4.46	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	846/1489	4.35	4.38	4.29	4.44	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	419/1006	4.18	4.17	4.00	4.11	4.18
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.03	4.19	4.41	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.78	4.38	4.39	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 105	****	4.78	4.20	4.23	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	3.95	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.53	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.57	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	3.97	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.25	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.13	4.45	4.61	****

```
                                  Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			

```
I    0            Other              8
?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENEE 663  8010                   University of Maryland                              Page  691
Title        SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT                Baltimore County                                  JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:                    (Instr. B)          Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
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  0  0  3  8  6  4.18 1014/1669  4.18  4.26  4.23 4.35  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  2  1  9  4  3.94 1192/1666  3.94  4.13  4.19 4.19  3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  1  0  2 10  4  3.94 1024/1421  3.94  4.01  4.24 4.33  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  0 11  4  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.02  4.15 4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 2 3 6 4  3.47 1249/1555  3.47  4.02  4.00 4.07  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 2 7 5 3.94 981/1543  3.94  4.11  4.06 4.27  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  2  6  8  4.24  885/1647  4.24  4.18  4.12 4.15  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67 4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 3 6 2 3.91 1092/1605  3.79  3.92  4.07 4.13  3.79

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  584/1514  4.59  4.57  4.39 4.37  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  1  1 13  4.80  788/1551  4.74  4.65  4.66 4.72  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 3 7 5  4.13  987/1503  4.20  4.26  4.24 4.22  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  0  1  7  7  4.40  770/1506  4.39  4.23  4.26 4.24  4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 0 0 4 2 7 4.23 458/1311  4.17  3.93  3.85 3.89  4.17

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 7 6  4.12  800/1490  4.12  3.96  4.05 4.18  4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 3 3 11 4.47 668/1502  4.47  4.26  4.26 4.46  4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 1 6 9 4.35 846/1489  4.35  4.38  4.29 4.44  4.35
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  0  0  0  4  6  7  4.18  419/1006  4.18  4.17  4.00 4.11  4.18

                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 233 ****  4.03  4.19 4.41  ****

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 3 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 112 ****  4.78  4.38 4.39  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/  92 ****  5.00  4.22 4.36  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   14  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 105 ****  4.78  4.20 4.23  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               14  0  2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/  98 ****  5.00  3.95 3.93  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 2 0 0 0 1 2.33 ****/  58 ****  5.00  4.22 4.53  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/  52 ****  5.00  4.06 4.57  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      14  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39 ****  5.00  4.39 4.90  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  14  1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  40 ****  5.00  3.97 4.31  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/  55 ****  3.90  4.34 4.45  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   15  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  42 ****  4.25  4.31 4.40  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46 ****  4.13  4.45 4.61  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			

```
I    0              Other              8
?    0
```

```
Enrollment:      18
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  0  0  3  8  6  4.18 1014/1669  4.18  4.26  4.23 4.35  4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  2  1  9  4  3.94 1192/1666  3.94  4.13  4.19 4.19  3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  1  0  2 10  4  3.94 1024/1421  3.94  4.01  4.24 4.33  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  0 11  4  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.02  4.15 4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  0  2  2  3  6  4  3.47 1249/1555  3.47  4.02  4.00 4.07  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  2  2  7  5  3.94  981/1543  3.94  4.11  4.06 4.27  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  2  6  8  4.24  885/1647  4.24  4.18  4.12 4.15  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67 4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  6  0  0  0  4  7  0  3.64 1293/1605  3.79  3.92  4.07 4.13  3.79


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67  584/1514  4.59  4.57  4.39 4.37  4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73  917/1551  4.74  4.65  4.66 4.72  4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  0  0  2  8  5  4.20  932/1503  4.20  4.26  4.24 4.22  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2  0  0  0  1  7  7  4.40  770/1506  4.39  4.23  4.26 4.24  4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  3  1  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  414/1311  4.17  3.93  3.85 3.89  4.17


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  4  7  6  4.12  800/1490  4.12  3.96  4.05 4.18  4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0  0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47  668/1502  4.47  4.26  4.26 4.46  4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0  0  0  1  1  6  9  4.35  846/1489  4.35  4.38  4.29 4.44  4.35
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  0  0  0  4  6  7  4.18  419/1006  4.18  4.17  4.00 4.11  4.18


                Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 233  ****  4.03  4.19 4.41  ****


                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  3  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.78  4.38 4.39  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14  1  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  92  ****  5.00  4.22 4.36  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     14  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 105  ****  4.78  4.20 4.23  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 14  0  2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/  98  ****  5.00  3.95 3.93  ****


                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  14  0  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.53  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  15  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 4.57  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        14  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.90  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    14  1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 4.31  ****


                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15  0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  55  ****  3.90  4.34 4.45  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     15  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  4.25  4.31 4.40  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  4.13  4.45 4.61  ****
```

                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0       A   9       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      11      Major        1
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0       B   2                                                                
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0       C   0       General              0      Under-grad     6      Non-major   16
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49   0       D   0                                                                
 Grad.     11      3.50-4.00   3       F   0       Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                   responses to be significant
```

```
I    0              Other              8
?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENEE 663  8010              University of Maryland                    Page  693
Title       SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT          Baltimore County                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:              (Instr. D)              Fall   2006                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
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  0  0  3  8  6  4.18 1014/1669  4.18  4.26  4.23 4.35 4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  2  1  9  4  3.94 1192/1666  3.94  4.13  4.19 4.19 3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  2 10  4  3.94 1024/1421  3.94  4.01  4.24 4.33 3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  0 11  4  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.02  4.15 4.24 4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  2  2  3  6  4  3.47 1249/1555  3.47  4.02  4.00 4.07 3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 2  7  5  3.94  981/1543  3.94  4.11  4.06 4.27 3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  2  6  8  4.24  885/1647  4.24  4.18  4.12 4.15 4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 17  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67 4.83 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 2 0 0 4  3  2  3.78 1195/1605  3.79  3.92  4.07 4.13 3.79

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  2  4  8  4.43  923/1514  4.59  4.57  4.39 4.37 4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67 1028/1551  4.74  4.65  4.66 4.72 4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  2  7  5  4.21  914/1503  4.20  4.26  4.24 4.22 4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  2  6  6  4.29  884/1506  4.39  4.23  4.26 4.24 4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 1 3  3  6  4.08  552/1311  4.17  3.93  3.85 3.89 4.17

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  4  7  6  4.12  800/1490  4.12  3.96  4.05 4.18 4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  3  3 11  4.47  668/1502  4.47  4.26  4.26 4.46 4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 1  6  9  4.35  846/1489  4.35  4.38  4.29 4.44 4.35
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0  0  0  4  6  7  4.18  419/1006  4.18  4.17  4.00 4.11 4.18

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 1 0  0  1  3.50 ****/ 233  ****  4.03  4.19 4.41 ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13 3 0 0 0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 112  ****  4.78  4.38 4.39 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 14 1 0 0 0  1  1  4.50 ****/  92  ****  5.00  4.22 4.36 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    14  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 105  ****  4.78  4.20 4.23 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                14  0  2  0  0  1  0  2.00 ****/  98  ****  5.00  3.95 3.93 ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 ****/  58  ****  5.00  4.22 4.53 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  15 0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/  52  ****  5.00  4.06 4.57 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  5.00  4.39 4.90 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14  1  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  40  ****  5.00  3.97 4.31 ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 1 0 0  1  0  2.50 ****/  55  ****  3.90  4.34 4.45 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  4.25  4.31 4.40 ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  4.13  4.45 4.61 ****
```

                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99   0       A   9       Required for Majors  0      Graduate     11      Major        1
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B   2
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0       C   0       General              0      Under-grad    6      Non-major   16
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49   0       D   0
 Grad.    11        3.50-4.00   3       F   0       Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
```

```
I    0            Other              8
?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENEE 712  0101                University of Maryland                        Page  694
Title         PATTERN REGOGN                   Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   CHANG, CHEIN-I                     Fall   2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       5
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  1  4  4.80  207/1669  4.80  4.26  4.23  4.35  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  439/1666  4.60  4.13  4.19  4.19  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  3  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1421  5.00  4.01  4.24  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  863/1617  4.20  4.02  4.15  4.24  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  141/1555  4.80  4.02  4.00  4.07  4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  2  3  4.60  298/1543  4.60  4.11  4.06  4.27  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1647  5.00  4.18  4.12  4.15  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  2  2  4.50  373/1605  4.50  3.92  4.07  4.13  4.50

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  679/1514  4.60  4.57  4.39  4.37  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.65  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  464/1503  4.60  4.26  4.24  4.22  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  770/1506  4.40  4.23  4.26  4.24  4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1311  5.00  3.93  3.85  3.89  5.00

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  340/1490  4.67  3.96  4.05  4.18  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 1208/1502  3.75  4.26  4.26  4.46  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  1  0  3  4.50  684/1489  4.50  4.38  4.29  4.44  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  2  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  235/1006  4.50  4.17  4.00  4.11  4.50

             Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.03  4.19  4.41  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 718W 0101          University of Maryland                    Page  695
Title                                    Baltimore County                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    CHETTI, SAMIR             Fall  2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    6
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   1   3   2  4.17 1026/1669  4.17  4.26  4.23  4.35  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83 1288/1666  3.83  4.13  4.19  4.19  3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   1   3  4.17  886/1421  4.17  4.01  4.24  4.33  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   1   2   2  4.20  863/1617  4.20  4.02  4.15  4.24  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   0   1   2   0   1  3.25 1359/1555  3.25  4.02  4.00  4.07  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0   1   2   0   1  3.25 1344/1543  3.25  4.11  4.06  4.27  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  481/1647  4.50  4.18  4.12  4.15  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   5   1  4.17 1438/1668  4.17  4.75  4.67  4.83  4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0   0   2   2   1  3.80 1172/1605  3.80  3.92  4.07  4.13  3.80

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  799/1514  4.50  4.57  4.39  4.37  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  705/1551  4.83  4.65  4.66  4.72  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00 1066/1503  4.00  4.26  4.24  4.22  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00 1069/1506  4.00  4.23  4.26  4.24  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  0   1   2   0   0  2.67 1208/1311  2.67  3.93  3.85  3.89  2.67

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   1   2   1   2  3.67 1088/1490  3.67  3.96  4.05  4.18  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00 1013/1502  4.00  4.26  4.26  4.46  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   1   0   2   3  4.17  973/1489  4.17  4.38  4.29  4.44  4.17
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   5   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1006  ****  4.17  4.00  4.11  ****


                               Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 800  0205        University of Maryland                      Page  696
Title          GRADUATE RESEARCH      Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    CARTER, GARY    (Instr. A)        Fall   2006                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      2
Questionnaires:  2                     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  0  2  5.00  1/1669  5.00  4.26  4.23  4.35  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1666  5.00  4.13  4.19  4.19  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1421  5.00  4.01  4.24  4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1617  5.00  4.02  4.15  4.24  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1555  5.00  4.02  4.00  4.07  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1543  5.00  4.11  4.06  4.27  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1647  5.00  4.18  4.12  4.15  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1668  5.00  4.75  4.67  4.83  5.00

        Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1514  5.00  4.57  4.39  4.37  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1551  4.50  4.65  4.66  4.72  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1503  5.00  4.26  4.24  4.22  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1506  5.00  4.23  4.26  4.24  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1311  5.00  3.93  3.85  3.89  5.00

        Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1490  5.00  3.96  4.05  4.18  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1502  5.00  4.26  4.26  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1489  5.00  4.38  4.29  4.44  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/1006  5.00  4.17  4.00  4.11  5.00

        Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 226  5.00  4.04  4.20  4.47  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 233  5.00  4.03  4.19  4.41  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 225  5.00  4.42  4.50  4.65  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 223  5.00  4.34  4.35  4.48  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 206  5.00  4.14  4.15  4.39  5.00

        Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 112  5.00  4.78  4.38  4.39  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0  0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  97  5.00  5.00  4.36  4.38  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  92  5.00  5.00  4.22  4.36  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 105  5.00  4.78  4.20  4.23  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  98  5.00  5.00  3.95  3.93  5.00

        Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  58  5.00  5.00  4.22  4.53  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  52  5.00  5.00  4.06  4.57  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  39  5.00  5.00  4.39  4.90  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  40  5.00  5.00  3.97  4.31  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  30  5.00  5.00  4.33  4.55  5.00

        Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  55  5.00  3.90  4.34  4.45  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  42  5.00  4.25  4.31  4.40  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  46  5.00  4.13  4.45  4.61  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  33  5.00  4.25  4.25  4.60  5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      0   0   0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/  29  5.00  5.00  4.34  5.00  5.00
```

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENEE 800  0205                University of Maryland                                    Page  697
Title          GRADUATE RESEARCH              Baltimore County                                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:                    (Instr. D)     Fall   2006                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       2
Questionnaires:   2                     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  0  2  5.00   1/1669   5.00  4.26   4.23 4.35  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1666   5.00  4.13   4.19 4.19  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1421   5.00  4.01   4.24 4.33  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1617   5.00  4.02   4.15 4.24  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1555   5.00  4.02   4.00 4.07  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1543   5.00  4.11   4.06 4.27  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1647   5.00  4.18   4.12 4.15  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1668   5.00  4.75   4.67 4.83  5.00

                   Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1490   5.00  3.96   4.05 4.18  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1502   5.00  4.26   4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1489   5.00  4.38   4.29 4.44  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1006   5.00  4.17   4.00 4.11  5.00

                   Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 226   5.00  4.04   4.20 4.47  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00   1/ 233   5.00  4.03   4.19 4.41  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 225   5.00  4.42   4.50 4.65  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 223   5.00  4.34   4.35 4.48  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 206   5.00  4.14   4.15 4.39  5.00

                   Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 112   5.00  4.78   4.38 4.39  5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 0 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  97   5.00  5.00   4.36 4.38  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  92   5.00  5.00   4.22 4.36  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/ 105   5.00  4.78   4.20 4.23  5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  98   5.00  5.00   3.95 3.93  5.00

                   Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  58   5.00  5.00   4.22 4.53  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  52   5.00  5.00   4.06 4.57  5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  39   5.00  5.00   4.39 4.90  5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  40   5.00  5.00   3.97 4.31  5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  30   5.00  5.00   4.33 4.55  5.00

                   Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  55   5.00  3.90   4.34 4.45  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  42   5.00  4.25   4.31 4.40  5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  46   5.00  4.13   4.45 4.61  5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  33   5.00  4.25   4.25 4.60  5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/  29   5.00  5.00   4.34 5.00  5.00

                          Frequency Distribution


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

```
I    0              Other              2
?    0
```