PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN

Title Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment:

28 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 688 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	943/1649	3.96	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	556/1648	4.22	4.27	4.23	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	753/1375	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.22	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1067/1595	3.74	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1381/1533	3.05	4.03	4.04	4.05	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1101/1512	3.67	4.22	4.10	4.11	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	894/1623	3.94	4.28	4.16	4.08	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	731/1646	4.95	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	619/1621	4.09	4.11	4.06	4.02	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	827/1568	4.56	4.48	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1		4.81	840/1572	4.85	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	8	11			4.24	4.19	4.28	4.25	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	7	12	4.27	952/1559	4.20	4.19	4.29	4.23	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	556/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/1384	2.75	3.98	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1382	3.50	4.27	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1368	3.17	4.33	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	***	4.08	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	176/ 221	3.74	3.22	4.16	4.07	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	206/ 243	3.43	4.01	4.12	3.89	3.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	5	2	4	4	3.47	200/ 212	3.91	4.35	4.40	4.21	3.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	2	0	3	7	3	3.60	180/ 209	3.82	4.06	4.35	4.12	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	3	8	4	3.82	444/ 555	4.17	4.69	4.29	4.22	3.82
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	83/ 288	3.75	4.02	3.68	3.58	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.60	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	3.42	3.97	3.99	4.05	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23	
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	18					
				?	1							

Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN

Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 28

28

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 689 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 11 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 1 1 5 3 3.73 1391/1649 3.96 4.31 4.28 4.27 3.73 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 873/1648 4.22 4.27 4.23 4.18 4.27 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 7 3 4.18 862/1375 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.22 4.18 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 0 2 3 4 3.90 1202/1595 3.74 4.29 4.20 4.21 3.90 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 1 4 1 2 3.50 1249/1533 3.05 4.03 4.04 4.05 3.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 1 5 3 4.22 723/1512 3.67 4.22 4.10 4.11 4.22 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 7 2 4.00 1029/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.08 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 632/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.02 4.30 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 803/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.39 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.64 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.27 918/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.25 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 3 5 4.09 1079/1559 4.20 4.19 4.29 4.23 4.09 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 1 2 4 2 3.50 1049/1352 4.00 4.02 3.98 3.97 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 1254/1384 2.75 3.98 4.08 4.11 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 946/1382 3.50 4.27 4.29 4.37 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 1229/1368 3.17 4.33 4.30 4.39 3.33 4. Were special techniques successful 8 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 4.08 3.95 4.00 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 64/ 221 3.74 3.22 4.16 4.07 4.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 188/243 3.43 4.01 4.12 3.89 3.75 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 65/212 3.91 4.35 4.40 4.21 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 139/209 3.82 4.06 4.35 4.12 4.25 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 323/555 4.17 4.69 4.29 4.22 4.40 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3 0 4.00 83/ 288 3.75 4.02 3.68 3.58 4.00 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.60 4.00 Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 8 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 100/110 3.42 3.97 3.99 4.05 3.33 Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	8					
				2	0							

PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN

Title Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 690 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.63 699/1568 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.25 4.26 4.27 4.28 4.29 4.29 4.28 4.29 4.29 4.28 4.29 4.29 4.28 4.29 4.29 4.28 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29 4.29	3.88 3.88 3.50 3.33 2.43 3.00 3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 4 2 3.88 1295/1649 3.96 4.31 4.28 4.2 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 4 2 3.88 1295/1648 4.22 4.27 4.23 4.1 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1208/1375 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 4 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 1470/1595 3.74 4.29 4.20 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 0 2 2 0 2.43 1516/1533 3.05 4.03 4.04 4.0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 1 1 1 1 3.00 1428/1512 3.67 4.22 4.10 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 1 1 4 3.63 1337/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0	3.88 3.50 3.33 2.43 3.00 3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 4 2 3.88 1254/1648 4.22 4.27 4.23 4.1 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1208/1375 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 4 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 1470/1595 3.74 4.29 4.20 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 0 2 2 0 2.43 1516/1533 3.05 4.03 4.04 4.0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 1 1 1 1 3.00 1428/1512 3.67 4.22 4.10 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 1 1 4 3.63 1337/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0	3.88 3.50 3.33 2.43 3.00 3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 3 2 3.50 1208/1375 4.00 4.41 4.27 4.2 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 4 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 1470/1595 3.74 4.29 4.20 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 0 2 2 0 2.43 1516/1533 3.05 4.03 4.04 4.0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 1 1 1 1 3.00 1428/1512 3.67 4.22 4.10 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 1 1 4 3.63 1337/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0	3.50 3.33 2.43 3.00 3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 4 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 1470/1595 3.74 4.29 4.20 4.2 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 0 2 2 0 2.43 1516/1533 3.05 4.03 4.04 4.0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 1 1 1 1 3.00 1428/1512 3.67 4.22 4.10 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 1 1 4 3.63 1337/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 4.0	3.33 2.43 3.00 3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 0 2 2 0 2.43 1516/1533 3.05 4.03 4.04 4.06 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 1 1 1 3.00 1428/1512 3.67 4.22 4.10 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 1 1 4 3.63 1337/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	2.43 3.00 3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 1 1 1 1 3.00 1428/1512 3.67 4.22 4.10 4.1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 1 1 4 3.63 1337/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	3.00 3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 1 1 4 3.63 1337/1623 3.94 4.28 4.16 4.0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.6 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	3.63 5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 4.95 4.85 4.69 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	5.00 3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 1261/1621 4.09 4.11 4.06 4.0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	3.67 4.63 4.75 4.13 4.25
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	4.75 4.13 4.25
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 699/1568 4.56 4.48 4.43 4.3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	4.75 4.13 4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 931/1572 4.85 4.84 4.70 4.6 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	4.75 4.13 4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 1064/1564 4.24 4.19 4.28 4.2	4.13 4.25
	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 3 4 4.25 966/1559 4.20 4.19 4.29 4.2	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 495/1352 4.00 4.02 3.98 3.9	
Discussion	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 1346/1384 2.75 3.98 4.08 4.1	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 1316/1382 3.50 4.27 4.29 4.3	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 136/1368 3.17 4.33 4.30 4.3	
4. Were special techniques successful 6 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 948 **** 4.08 3.95 4.0	
Laboratory	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 1 0 3 2 0 3.00 216/221 3.74 3.22 4.16 4.0	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information $$ 2 $$ 1 $$ 3 $$ 2 $$ 3.00 $$ 220/ 243 3.43 4.01 4.12 3.8	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 2 1 1 2 3.50 198/212 3.91 4.35 4.40 4.2	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 1 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 180/209 3.82 4.06 4.35 4.1	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 349/555 4.17 4.69 4.29 4.2	4.29
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.6	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.47 4.5	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 81 **** 5.00 4.43 4.3	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 6 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.35 4.4	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3 1 0 1 1 2 0 3.25 215/ 288 3.75 4.02 3.68 3.5	3.25
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 34/52 4.00 4.50 4.06 3.5	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria $$ 6 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 2 $$ 4.00 $$ 25/ 48 4.00 4.50 4.09 4.2	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 6 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 28/ 39 4.00 4.50 4.47 4.4	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 6 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** 5.00 4.38 4.3	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 4 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.6	4.00
Self Paced	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned $$ 6 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 2 $$ 4.00 $$ 35/ 53 4.00 4.00 4.30 4.3	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 $28/$ 30 3.50 4.25 4.16 4.4	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 6 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 41 **** 4.50 4.43 5.0	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 6 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.42 5.0	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 5 1 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 96/110 3.42 3.97 3.99 4.0	3.50

Title PRIN ELECTRICAL ENGN

Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 690 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

DIGITAL SIG PROC

Title Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 691 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	NA 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3 0 1 1 0 0 0 2	4 2 1 0 3 2 1 1 4 2	2 1 2 0 2 2 2	3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	1481/1 1112/1 1285/1 366/1 687/1 1270/1 1544/1 1345/1	.649 .648 .375 .595 .533 .512 .623 .646 .621	4.50 3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00	Mean 4.31 4.27 4.41 4.29 4.03 4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	Mean 4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.46 4.34 4.44 4.35 4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81	4.50 3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 1 1 0 1 0 0 2	1 0 3 2 1 1 4 2	1 2 0 2 2 2 2 0 0	3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	1481/1 1112/1 1285/1 366/1 687/1 1270/1 1544/1 1345/1	.648 .375 .595 .533 .512 .623 .646 .621	3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	4.27 4.41 4.29 4.03 4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.34 4.44 4.35 4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 1 1 0 1 0 0 2	1 0 3 2 1 1 4 2	1 2 0 2 2 2 2 0 0	3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	1481/1 1112/1 1285/1 366/1 687/1 1270/1 1544/1 1345/1	.648 .375 .595 .533 .512 .623 .646 .621	3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	4.27 4.41 4.29 4.03 4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.34 4.44 4.35 4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	3.50 3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 1 0 1 0 0 2	0 3 2 1 1 4 2	2 0 2 2 2 0 0	3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	1112/1 1285/1 366/1 687/1 1270/1 1544/1 1345/1	.375 .595 .533 .512 .623 .646 .621	3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	4.41 4.29 4.03 4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.44 4.35 4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	3.75 3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 1 0 0 2	3 2 1 1 4 2	0 2 2 2 0 0	3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	1285/1 366/1 687/1 1270/1 1544/1 1345/1	.595 .533 .512 .623 .646 .621	3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	4.29 4.03 4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.35 4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	3.75 4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0	0 1 0 0 2	2 1 1 4 2	2 2 2 0 0	4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	366/1 687/1 1270/1 1544/1 1345/1	.533 .512 .623 .646 .621	4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	4.03 4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	4.50 4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 2 2	1 1 4 2	2 0 0	4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	687/1 1270/1 1544/1 1345/1	.512 .623 .646 .621	4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50	4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	4.25 3.75 4.00 3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 2 2	1 4 2	2 0 0	3.75 4.00 3.50	1270/1 1544/1 1345/1 1549/1	.623 .646 .621	3.75 4.00 3.50	4.28 4.85 4.11	4.16 4.69 4.06	4.29 4.81 4.20	3.75 4.00 3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0	2 0	4 2 0	0 0	4.00 3.50 2.67	1544/1 1345/1 1549/1	.646 .621	4.00	4.85 4.11	4.69 4.06	4.81 4.20	4.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0	2 2 0	2	0	3.50 2.67	1345/1	621	3.50	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0	2	0	0	2.67	1549/1						
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0	0	0	0		-			.568	2.67	4.48	4.43	4.52	2 67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0 0	0	0	0		-			568	2.67	4.48	4.43	4.52	2 67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0	0			1	2								4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0	0		2			3	4.75	931/1	572	4.75	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.75
	-	1		1	1	0	2.75	1532/1	564	2.75	4.19	4.28	4.41	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0	2		2	1	0	0	2.00	1550/1	559	2.00	4.19	4.29	4.41	2.00
		0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1219/1	352	3.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1	384	4.50	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1		4.67	4.27	4.29		4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2	0	0	0	0	1	1		654/1		4.50	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful 1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/	948		4.08	3.95	4.03	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	219/	221	2.50	3.22	4.16	4.27	2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	155/		4.00	4.01	4.12		4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3	0	0	0	0	0	1			212	5.00	4.35	4.40		5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/		4.67		4.29	4.66	
Quaries and														
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/	288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/	312	4 00	4.05	3 68	3 83	4 00
J. Did conferences help you carry out freta activities	U	U	U	U	1	U	1.00	007	J12	1.00	4.05	3.00	3.03	1.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/	41	4.00	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.00
Frequency D	Dist	ribu	ition											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Rea	sons					Тур	e			Majors	s
00-27	кес	quire	ea Io	r Ma	jors		0	Grad	uate	2	3	Majo	r.	3
	General					1	Under-grad 1 N				Non-	major	1	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0	General						51140	- 5-	grad I Non major I					
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 0 F 0	Ele	ectiv	res				0	####	- N	leans t	here a	ere are not enough		

Other

2

Ρ

I

0

2

Course-Section: ENEE 620 0101 University of Maryland Title PROB RANDOM PROC Baltimore County

Title PROB RANDOM PROC
Instructor: ADALI, TULAY

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Enrollment: 9

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 692 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 1057/1649 4.17 4.31 4.28 4.46 4.17 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 1 1 4 0 3.50 1481/1648 3.50 4.27 4.23 4.34 3.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 875/1375 4.17 4.41 4.27 4.44 4.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 1 2 0 1 2.80 1566/1595 2.80 4.29 4.20 4.35 2.80 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 815/1533 4.00 4.03 4.04 4.28 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 3 2 4.17 782/1512 4.17 4.22 4.10 4.35 4.177. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 1 1 3 0 3.00 1533/1623 3.00 4.28 4.16 4.29 3.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 1193/1646 4.50 4.85 4.69 4.81 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 914/1621 4.00 4.11 4.06 4.20 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 2 3 1 3.83 1373/1568 3.83 4.48 4.43 4.52 3.83 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 765/1572 4.83 4.84 4.70 4.83 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 1388/1564 3.50 4.19 4.28 4.41 3.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 1031/1559 4.17 4.19 4.29 4.41 4.17 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 0 3 1 0 3.25 1160/1352 3.25 4.02 3.98 4.10 3.25 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 2 0 3.20 1209/1384 3.20 3.98 4.08 4.30 3.20 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 540/1382 4.60 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.60 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 752/1368 4.40 4.33 4.30 4.56 4.40 4. Were special techniques successful 2 3 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 917/ 948 2.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 2.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 221 **** 3.22 4.16 4.27 **** 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.01 4.12 4.61 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 1 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 288 **** 4.02 3.68 3.87 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.50 4.06 4.51 **** 1 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 3.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.50 4.09 4.47 **** 6 0 0 1 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** 4.50 4.47 4.58 **** 6 0 0 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 4.05 3.68 3.83 **** Self Paced

Frequency Distribution

5 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 40/110 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00

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

Course-Section: ENEE 623 0101
Title COMMUN THEORY I
Instructor: LABERGE, E.F.

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 693 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4				
Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Q.,t.						Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		General															
1 Did voi	u dain ne	w insights, skills from	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.75
		tor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648		4.27	4.23		4.75
		estions reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1375		4.41	4.27	4.44	5.00
		ations reflect the e		0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1595		4.29	4.20	4.35	5.00
		adings contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	1	3		180/1533		4.03	4.04	4.28	4.75
		ignments contribute		0	1	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1512			4.10		5.00
		system clearly explanation		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1623		4.28	4.16		5.00
		was class cancelled	ainea	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1646		4.85	4.69		5.00
		rade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	-		165/1621				4.20	
		T															
1 Wome +1	ho inatro	Lecture ctor's lectures well	nwanawad	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4 25	1121/1568	4.25	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.25
		tor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1572		4.48	4.43	4.83	5.00
		erial presented and		1	0	0	0	0	1	2					4.70		4.67
		s contribute to what		0	0	0	0	0	1	3		390/1559		4.19	4.29		4.75
		techniques enhance		0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1352		4.19			5.00
5. Did au	ulovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.02	3.90	4.10	5.00
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1159/1384	3.33	3.98	4.08	4.30	3.33
2. Were a	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	1	1	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.00
4. Were sp	. Were special techniques successful				0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.08	3.95	4.03	3.50
		Laboratory															
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab reports c	learly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00
E Works as	mitomio f	Seminar or grading made clea:	•	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4 00	4 02	2 60	2 07	4 00
5. were c	riceria i	or grading made clea.	<u>c</u>	۷	U	U	U	U	2	U	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.08	3.87	4.00
		Field Work															
5. Did con	nferences	help you carry out	field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	
									, 								,
00-27					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	2	Graduat	e	3	Majo	or	3
28-55																	
56-83					Ge	nera	l				2	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0								1			.1			.1-
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1][]
			P 0 I 0		0+1	her					0	respons	es co n	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
					Ut.	uer					U						
			? 0														

Title SOLID STATE ELECTRONIC

CHEN, YUNG JUI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 694 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	eque:	ncies	\$		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did	vou gain n	ew insights,skil	la from this	course	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4 31	4.28	4.46	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	1		556/1648	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.50
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	0		950/1375	4.00		4.27	4.44	
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	1	0		1067/1595	4.00	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.00
		eadings contribut			0	0	0	0	0	2		4.00		4.00	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.00
	_	signments contril	_		0	0	0	0	0	2			883/1512	4.00	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.00
		g system clearly		7	0	0	0	0	1	0			1029/1623	4.00		4.16	4.29	4.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1646			4.69	4.81	
		grade the overal		ffectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621				4.20	4.00
		Lecture																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	well prepare	ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.48	4.43	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem interes			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
		terial presented			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.00
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.00
		l techniques enha			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.00
		-	-	3														
1 543		Discuss		3	1	0	0	0	0	-1	0	4 00	705 /1004	4 00	2 00	4 00	4 20	4 00
		ussions contribut			1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	795/1384		3.98	4.08	4.30	
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participat				1 1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.52 4.56	
3. DIG	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio				1	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.33	4.30	4.50	5.00
		Laborate																
5. Were	e requireme	nts for lab repo	rts clearly :	specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00
		Seminar																
5. Were	e criteria	for grading made	clear		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00
		Field Wo	ork															
5. Did	conference	s help you carry	out field a	ctivities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	2
84-150		3.00-3.49	0	D 0								_						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot)	her					2						
				3 0														

SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES

Title

Instructor: HOCH, PETER

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2008

Page 695 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	4.02	3.98	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384		3.98	4.08	4.30	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	522/1368	4.67		4.30	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	936/ 948	2.00	4.08	3.95	4.03	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	221/ 221	1.00	3.22	4.16	4.27	1.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	4.01	4.12	4.61	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.35	4.40	4.73	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.42	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.06	4.51	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.47	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.44	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	35/ 53	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.37	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.25	4.16	4.49	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.50	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.67	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	3.97	3.99	3.92	5.00

Title SYSTEMS ENG PRINCIPLES

Instructor: HOCH, PETER

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 695 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Title SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT (Instr. A)

Instructor: MARTIN, PAUL Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 696 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,skills	from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.12	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.12
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear th	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.29
3. Did	the exam q	questions reflect t	he expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.53
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect th	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.65
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contribute	to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	774/1533	4.06	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.06
6. Did	written as	signments contribu	te to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	966/1512	3.94	4.22	4.10	4.35	3.94
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly e	xplained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.65
8. How	many times	was class cancell	ed	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	864/1621	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.92
		Lecture															
1. Were	e the instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	667/1568	4.70	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.70
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem interest	ed in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	790/1572	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.70
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presented a	nd explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	960/1564	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.34
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	673/1559	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.32
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enhan	ce your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	624/1352	4.39	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.39
		Discussio	n														
1. Did	class disc	ussions contribute	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.40
			raged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.38
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage fai	r and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.44
4. Were	e special t	echniques successf	ul	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.63
		Laborator	У														
2. Were	e you provi	ded with adequate	background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	****
		Seminar															
			the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88		5.00	4.54	4.63	***
		ons contribute to		16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92		5.00	4.35	4.42	***
5. Were	e criteria	for grading made of	lear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.02	3.68	3.87	****
		Field Wor	==														
			to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52		4.50	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did	you clearl	y understand your	evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
		Self Pac															
	_	_	to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00			4.00	4.30	4.37	***
		stions make clear t		16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30		4.25	4.16	4.49	***
3. Were	e your cont	acts with the inst	ructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0			Red	quire	ea f	or Ma	ıjor	s	0	Graduat	e	6	Majo	or	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0			<i>C</i> -		1				1	TT7		. 1	37		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0			Gei	nera:	T				1	Under-g	rad l	L1	Non-	-major	8
84-150		3.00-3.49 1 3.50-4.00 9			m1	04+1-					0	нити.	Moore +	horr			-h
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 9	P 0		ΕIE	ecti	ves				U	#### -				_	ìTT
			Р 0 I 0		O+1	her				1	.6	respons	es to I	e sigr	iiicar	IL	
			s 0 T 0		OCI	ner.				1	. U						

? 0

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT Title Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 697

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 2 2 5 8 4.12 1106/1649 4.12 4.31 4.28 4.46 4.12 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 4 9 4.29 850/1648 4.29 4.27 4.23 4.34 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 6 10 4.53 529/1375 4.53 4.41 4.27 4.44 4.53 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 6 11 4.65 342/1595 4.65 4.29 4.20 4.35 4.65 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 2 2 5 7 4.06 774/1533 4.06 4.03 4.04 4.28 4.06 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 5 5 6 3.94 966/1512 3.94 4.22 4.10 4.35 3.94 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 4 12 4.65 345/1623 4.65 4.28 4.16 4.29 4.65 0 1 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 1 5 2 4.13 835/1621 3.92 4.11 4.06 4.20 3.92 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 387/1568 4.70 4.48 4.43 4.52 4.70 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 840/1572 4.70 4.84 4.70 4.83 4.70 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 780/1564 4.34 4.19 4.28 4.41 4.34 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 763/1559 4.32 4.19 4.29 4.41 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 1 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 275/1352 4.39 4.02 3.98 4.10 4.39 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 2 5 8 4.40 541/1384 4.40 3.98 4.08 4.30 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 3 4 9 4.38 740/1382 4.38 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 3 3 10 4.44 722/1368 4.44 4.33 4.30 4.56 4.44 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 6 10 4.63 164/948 4.63 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.63 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 243 **** 4.01 4.12 4.61 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 88 **** 5.00 4.54 4.63 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned $16 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.35 4.42 **** 16 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 288 **** 4.02 3.68 3.87 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 52 **** 4.50 4.06 4.51 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 4.50 4.09 4.47 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 53 **** 4.00 4.30 4.37 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.25 4.16 4.49 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 41 *** 4.50 4.43 4.43 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 A 11 B 4 C 2 D 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 6 Major 00-27 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 2.00-2.99 0 General 1 Under-grad 11 0 Non-major 8 0 3.00-3.49 1 6 3.50-4.00 9 84-150 0 Electives 0 Grad. #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 16 Other

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010 University of Maryland

Title SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 698

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain	new insights, skills from this course	е	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	1106/1649	4.12	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.12
2. Did the instr	ructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.29
3. Did the exam	questions reflect the expected goals	S	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.53
ł. Did other eva	aluations reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.6
5. Did assigned	readings contribute to what you lear	rned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	774/1533	4.06	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.06
5. Did written a	assignments contribute to what you le	earned	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	966/1512	3.94	4.22	4.10	4.35	3.94
_	ing system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	1	4		4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.6
-	es was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646			4.69	4.81	
9. How would you	a grade the overall teaching effective	veness	8	1	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.92	4.11	4.06	4.20	3.92
	Lecture															
1. Were the inst	tructor's lectures well prepared		7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	588/1568	4.70	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.70
2. Did the instr	ructor seem interested in the subject	t	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1241/1572	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.70
3. Was lecture m	material presented and explained clea	arly	7	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	780/1564	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.34
4. Did the lectu	ares contribute to what you learned		6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1079/1559	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.32
5. Did audiovisu	ual techniques enhance your understar	nding	7	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	303/1352	4.39	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.39
	Discussion															
1. Did class dis	scussions contribute to what you lear	rned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.40
	dents actively encouraged to particip		1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	740/1382	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.38
3. Did the instr	ructor encourage fair and open discus	ssion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368	4.44	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.44
4. Were special	techniques successful		1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.63
2. Were vou prov	Laboratory vided with adequate background inform	mation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	***
• •	-															
1. Were assigned	Seminar d topics relevant to the announced th	neme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****
_	tions contribute to what you learned		16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.42	***
	a for grading made clear		16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288	***	4.02	3.68	3.87	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field exp	perience contribute to what you learn	ned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****
_	rly understand your evaluation criter		16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48		4.50	4.09	4.47	****
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-page	ed system contribute to what you lear	rned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	****
	estions make clear the expected goal		16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30		4.25	4.16	4.49	****
	ntacts with the instructor helpful		16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50		4.43	****
		Freque	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected G	Grades				Re	asons	5			T∨	pe			Majors	:
00-27 7 28-55 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 11 1.00-1.99 0 B 4			Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	6	Majo	or	9
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 0 C 2	2		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L1	Non-	-major	8
84-150 0 Grad. 6	3.00-3.49 1 D 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0	-		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
	P C	-								_	respons					
	I (-		Oth	ner				1	.6						

Course-Section: ENEE 663 8010 University of Maryland Title SYSTEM IMPLEM INTEGRAT

Baltimore County

Page 699

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. D) Fall 2008 Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eanei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	8	4 12	1106/1649	4.12	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	529/1375	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	342/1595	4.65	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	774/1533		4.03	4.04	4.28	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	966/1512		4.22	4.10	4.35	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646		4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	3	3	1		1225/1621		4.11	4.06	4.20	3.92
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	U	U	3	3	_	3.71	1225/1021	3.94	4.11	4.00	4.20	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	636/1568		4.48	4.43	4.52	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1071/1572	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.83	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	854/1564	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	4	4		1009/1559	4.32	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	423/1352	4.39	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	541/1384	4.40	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	740/1382		4.27	4.29	4.52	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	722/1368		4.33	4.30	4.56	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	164/ 948		4.08	3.95	4.03	4.63
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.01	4.12	4.61	***
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	г оо	4 54	1 (2	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16 16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 92		5.00	4.54	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288		5.00	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	^^^^/ 288	* * * *	4.02	3.68	3.87	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.25	4.16	4.49	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.50	4.43	4.43	****
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				P.O.	asons	-			Ty	ne			Majors	•
creates marined cum. GPA maperced Grades				V.G	450115	ی			ıy.	ρc			Ma JULS	,

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENEE 670 8010 Title SYST ENGR PROJ

HOCH, PETER Instructor:

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 700 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnai:	Student	ıt Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
--	---------	-----------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	871/1649	4.33			4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595		4.29	4.20	4.35	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1533	***	4.03	4.04	4.28	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	448/1623	4.56	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	600/1564	4.56	4.19	4.28	4.41	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.19	4.29	4.41	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	326/1384			4.08	4.30	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1382		4.27	4.29	4.52	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368		4.33	4.30	4.56	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	***	4.01	4.12	4.61	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.43	****
Field Work							_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	Τ		****/ 52	****	4.50	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.05	3.68	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.30	4.37	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	3.97	3.99	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 680 0101 Title

ELECTROMAG THEORY I

Instructor: YAN, LI Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 701 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	ırse Evalua	tion Quest	ionnaire
-------------	-------------	------------	----------

							Fre	equer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain new	v insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.00
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	2		897/1648	4.25		4.23		4.25
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2			546/1375	4.50		4.27		4.50
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	1			497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20		4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.25
6. Did wr	itten assi	ignments contri	ibute to	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How man	ny times v	vas class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.25
		Lecture	e															
1. Were ti	he instruc	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.75
		or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1			931/1572	4.75		4.70	4.83	
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3			939/1564		4.19		4.41	
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	2	1			1277/1559				4.41	
				,	-	-	-	_	_	_	_							
		Discus								_								
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1			437/1384					4.50
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1			616/1382				4.52	
3. Did the	e instruct	cor encourage :	taır and	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	Τ	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.50
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made			0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00
1 1	-	Field V			_		•	•	•	_		4 00						
5. Did co	nierences	help you carry	y out f	ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were th	here enoug	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.97	3.99	3.92	4.00
				Frequ	an asz	Diet	-rih	ıtior	,									
				riequ	ency	DISC		acioi.	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1							ed fo	or Ma	 jors	- – – – S	1	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1		-										5		
56-83								L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	1
84-150	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0												3				-	
Grad.	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h		
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENEE 684 0101

Title INTRO PHOTONICS Instructor: YAN, LI

Instructor: YAN,
Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 702 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ceneral									_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. D. Did without revaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. D. Did without revaluations reflect the expected goals 9. D. D. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. D. Did with readings contribute to what you learned 9. D. Did with reading system clearly explained 9. Did with reading syste			Question	S 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem written and explained clearly 9. Did daddiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did class discussions contribute to written written written written wri			Genera	1															
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.75 208/1375 4.75 4.41 4.27 4.44 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 44/1533 4.43 4.03 4.04 4.28 4.43 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 6 4.75 202/1623 4.75 4.28 4.25 4.85 4.88 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 6 4.75 202/1623 4.75 4.28 4.16 4.29 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did yo	u gain new	v insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expeted goals 0 2 0 0 0 2 4 4 6.07 321/1595 4.07 4.08 4.03 4.04 4.28 4.43 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 7 4.88 123/1512 4.88 4.22 4.10 4.35 4.88 7.88 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89 1.89 1	2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	414/1648	4.63	4.27	4.23	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 4 4 .43 454/1533 4.43 4.03 4.04 4.28 4.48	3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.41	4.27	4.44	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 123/1512 4.88 4.22 4.10 4.35 4.88 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.28 4.10 4.29 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.29 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.81 4.70 4.81 4.85 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.81 4.70 4.00 4.83 4.85 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.81 4.70 4.83 4.85 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.48 4.81 4.70 4.83 4.85 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.48 4.43 4.52 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 4 4 4.50 651/1564 4.50 4.81 4.43 4.52 5.00 9. How would you grade the owner and you understanding 0 5 0 0 0 1 0 2 4 4.38 665/1572 4.88 4.84 4.70 4.18 4.55 5.00 9. How would you grade the owner would repeated and explained clearly of 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 6 4.75 220/1623 4.75 4.28 4.16 4.29 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.11 4.06 4.20 4.33 Ecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.48 4.43 4.52 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 7 4.88 665/1572 4.88 4.84 4.70 4.83 4.89 3.89 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.85 4.69 4.81 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 2 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.11 4.06 4.20 4.33 **Lecture*** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.48 4.43 4.52 5.00 2. Did then instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4 48 665/1572 4.88 4.84 4.70 4.83 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4 4.80 665/1574 4.50 4.19 4.28 4.41 4.50 4. Did the lactures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4 4.88 238/1559 4.88 4.19 4.29 4.41 4.88 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 0 1 0 2 1 2 4.00 795/1384 4.00 3.98 4.08 4.30 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 426/1368 4.75 4.33 4.02 3.98 4.00 4.03 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 426/1368 4.75 4.33 4.02 3.68 3.87 4.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/555 5.00 4.69 4.29 4.66 5.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 5 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	6. Did wr	itten assi	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	123/1512	4.88	4.22	4.10	4.35	4.88
Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 595/1621 4.33 4.11 4.06 4.20 4.33	7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explair	ed	0	0	•	0	-	2	6	4.75	- ,	4.75	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.75
New Lecture	8. How man	ny times w	was class canc	elled		0	-	•	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
1. Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 5.00 1./1568 5.00 4.48 4.70 4.83 4.82 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 665/1572 4.88 4.84 4.70 4.83 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 665/1572 4.88 4.84 4.70 4.83 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 266/1572 4.88 4.19 4.28 4.41 4.50 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.1	9. How wo	uld you gr	rade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4 .88 665/1572 4.88 4 .84 4.70 4.83 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 7 4.88 238/1559 4.88 4.19 4.28 4.11 4.50 4.01 bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 7 4 8.8 238/1559 4.88 4.19 4.29 4.41 4.88 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 0 1 0 0 2 4.33 457/1352 4.33 4.02 3.98 4.10 4.33 bid the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 2 4.33 457/1352 4.33 4.02 3.98 4.10 4.33 bid the instructor encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 2 4.00 795/1384 4.00 3.98 4.08 4.30 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 203/948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.55 4.75 4.80 ere requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.50 203/948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.55 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05			Lectur	e															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 651/1564 4.50 4.19 4.28 4.41 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 457/1352 4.33 4.02 3.98 4.10 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 795/1384 4.00 3.98 4.08 4.30 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 426/1368 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50	1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.48	4.43	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 0 1 1 7 4.88 238/1559 4.88 4.19 4.29 4.41 4.88 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5 0 0 1 1 7 4.88 238/1559 4.88 4.09 4.02 3.98 4.10 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 795/1384 4.00 3.98 4.08 4.30 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 46/1368 4.75 4.33 4.00 4.56 4.75 4.00 4.00 8.00 1 1 1 4.50 203/ 948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.00 4.00 8.00 1 1 1 4.50 203/ 948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.00 4.00 8.00 1 1 1 4.50 203/ 948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.00 4.00 8.00 4.00 8.00 4.00 8.00 4.00 8.00 4.00 8.00 4.00 8.00 4.00 8.00 4.00 4						0	-	-	-	-	_	7		665/1572	4.88	4.84		4.83	4.88
Discussion														651/1564		4.19	4.28	4.41	4.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 795/1384 4.00 3.98 4.08 4.30 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 426/1368 4.75 4.33 4.30 4.56 4.75 4.36 4.75 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 203/ 948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.80 4.8									-			-							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 795/1384 4.00 3.98 4.08 4.30 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 426/1368 4.75 4.33 4.30 4.56 4.75 4.80 4.27 4.29 4.50 4.00 4.00 8.00 1 1 4.50 203/948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.00 4.00 8.00 1 1 4.50 203/948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.00 4.00 8.00 1 1 4.50 203/948 4.50 4.00 4.00 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.00 8.00 1 1 5.00 1 5.00 1	5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance you	r understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 616/1382 4.50 4.27 4.29 4.52 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 203/948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 4.56 4.75 4.33 4.30 4.56 4.75 4.88 4.75 4.33 4.30 4.56 4.75 4.88 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.08 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.08 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.08 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.08 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.08 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50 4.50			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 426/1368 4.75 4.33 4.30 4.56 4.75 4. Were special techniques successful 3 3 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 203/ 948 4.50 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.50 Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/ 555 5.00 4.69 4.29 4.66 5.00 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 4 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 4.00 83/ 288 4.00 4.02 3.68 3.87 4.00 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5 0 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 68/ 312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 40/ 110 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.00
A. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Type Majors Type Majors Required for Majors Graduate Type Majors Required for Majors Self Paced Self Paced OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors Self Paced Self Paced OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors Graduate Frequency Distribution Credits Earned OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors Self Paced Self Paced OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors OO-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 3 Required for Majors OO-28 0 Self Paced OO-29 0 C O General OO-29 0 C O General OO-20 0 Self Paced OO-20	2. Were a	ll student	s actively en	couraged	to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.52	4.50
Laboratory Seminar S					open discussion									426/1368	4.75	4.33	4.30	4.56	4.75
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Required for Majors Type Majors Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 8 3 3 .00-2.99 0 1.00-1.99 0 8 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 1.00-1.99 0 8 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General Distribution Required for Majors General Distribution Required for Majors Ounder-grad Major Required for Majors Field Work Self Paced Self	4. Were s	pecial tec		3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.08	3.95	4.03	4.50		
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 8 3 3 .00-2.99 0 1.00-1.99 0 8 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 1.00-1.99 0 2 6 6 8 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 0 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 Other 1 0 Other 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Labora																
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	5. Were re	equirement		-	rly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Trequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Comina	x															
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 40/110 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.05 3.68 3.83 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.00 4.07 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.00 4.07 4.00 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00 68/312 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	5. Were c	riteria fo		=		4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 40/ 110 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives O #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3																			
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 40/110 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3	E Did co	nforonaca			ld patinition	_	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	60/ 212	4 00	4 OE	2 60	2 02	4 00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 3 0 0 0 0 5 0 4.00 40/110 4.00 3.97 3.99 3.92 4.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 responses to be significant	5. Dia co	nrerences	neip you carr	y out lie	id activities	5	U	U	U	U	3	U	4.00	00/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.00	3.03	4.00
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3																			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major 7 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 3 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td>5. Were t</td> <td>here enoug</td> <td>gh proctors io</td> <td>r all the</td> <td>students</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> <td>Ü</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>0</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>40/ 110</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>3.97</td> <td>3.99</td> <td>3.92</td> <td>4.00</td>	5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors io	r all the	students	3	0	Ü	0	0	5	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	3.97	3.99	3.92	4.00
00-27					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	1									
00-27	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Tvi	oe			Maiors	
28-55																			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 5 Non-major 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant									ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	r	7
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 3									1				2	Under-a	rad	5	Non-	maior	1
Grad. 3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 3									-				-	onder 9.		-	1,011		_
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 3													0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
I 0 Other 3	oraa.	3	3.30 1.00	_			111						-					_	
							Oth	ner					3	T COPOID					
					? 0								-						

University of Maryland Page 703
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 3	0 0 3 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1 0 3 0 2	3 3 1 2 3 5 3 3	4 3 3 2	3.88 4.57	816/1649 897/1648 233/1375 782/1595 594/1533 553/1512 1198/1623 1130/1646 1302/1621	4.38 4.25 4.80 4.29 4.38 3.88 4.57 3.60	4.31 4.27 4.41 4.29 4.03 4.22 4.28 4.85 4.11	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.46 4.34 4.44 4.35 4.28 4.35 4.29 4.81 4.20	4.38 4.25 4.80 4.29 4.29 4.38 3.88 4.57 3.60
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 3	0 0 1 0 1	2 0 1 1 0	1 0 1 1	1 2 0 1		4.71 3.71	1414/1568 1003/1572 1316/1564 1045/1559 914/1352	3.71 4.71 3.71 4.14 3.75	4.48 4.84 4.19 4.19 4.02	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.52 4.83 4.41 4.41 4.10	3.71 4.71 3.71 4.14 3.75
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 5	1 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	3 2 1 0	2 3 3 2	2	4.00	1181/1384 946/1382 1051/1368 431/ 948	3.29 4.00 3.86 4.00	3.98 4.27 4.33 4.08	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.30 4.52 4.56 4.03	3.29 4.00 3.86 4.00
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.66	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	83/ 288 68/ 312				3.87	
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1			****/ 110					
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27			quire nera:		or Ma	jors		1	Graduat Under-g		5	Majo Non-	or major	5
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ectiv	ves				0	#### - I respons				_	rh

Course-Section: ENEE 712 0101

Title PATTERN REGOGN
Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Course-Section: ENEE 788W 0101

Title TOPICS IN ELECTROPHYSI

Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 704 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	230/1649	4.86	4.31	4.28	4.46	4.86
_	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	475/1648		4.27	4.23		
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375		4.41	4.27	4.44	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.86
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.60	4.03	4.04	4.28	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.22	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained					1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.28	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.11	4.06	4.20	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.48	4.43	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572		4.84		4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	2		4.71			4.19	4.28	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	1	-	4.57	,		4.19	4.29		4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	690/1352		4.02			4.00
		_	_		_	•	_	_	-		-		,					
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.98	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382		4.27	4.08	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	1		4.75	426/1368		4.33	4.29		4.75
4. Were special techniques successful						0	0	0	0	1		4.75	122/ 948		4.33	3.95		4.75
4. Wele s	special te	cilliques succe	SSIUI		3	U	U	U	U	_	3	4.75	122/ 940	4.75	4.00	3.95	4.03	4.75
		Labora	_		2													
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material						0	0	0	0	2		4.60	53/ 221	4.60	3.22	4.16	4.27	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information						0	0	0	0	1		4.80	27/ 243	4.80	4.01	4.12		4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities						0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	122/ 212	4.40	4.35	4.40		4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance					2	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	45/ 209	4.80	4.06	4.35	4.80	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	323/ 555	4.40	4.69	4.29	4.66	4.40
		Semina	r															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear					1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.02	3.68	3.87	4.00
		Field	Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities						0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.05	3.68	3.83	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Type			Majors		
00-27 28-55	2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 5 B 0	Required for Majors					5	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	5	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						1	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	-major	2	
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	2	D 0	General							_	onder g.	Luu	-	14011-	a JUI	۷
Grad.							ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enough				rh	
Jiaa.	Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					11.0	CI	v CD					responses to be significant					
I O						Other						3	responded to be brightricane					
				? 0		0.01	-01					-						
				. •														