

Course-Section: ENEE 302 1  
 Title Prin Electrical Engrn  
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F  
 Enrollment: 92  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 604  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	470/1509	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	356/1509	4.77	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	359/1287	4.78	4.07	4.30	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	979/1459	4.33	3.89	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	0	5	3	3.80	1009/1406	4.09	3.78	4.09	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	807/1384	4.34	3.93	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	3	12	4.28	738/1489	4.66	4.05	4.17	4.14	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	722/1506	4.91	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	190/1463	4.75	4.19	4.09	4.08	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	497/1438	4.82	4.33	4.46	4.43	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	588/1421	4.94	4.48	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	556/1411	4.72	4.13	4.31	4.29	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	381/1405	4.81	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	458/1236	4.59	4.32	4.00	4.07	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1260	4.02	3.90	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1255	4.19	4.13	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1258	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	4	0	1	4	1	2.80	180/ 184	3.41	3.81	4.16	4.07	2.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	191/ 198	3.65	3.74	4.22	4.17	3.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	177/ 184	4.02	4.15	4.48	4.52	3.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	164/ 177	3.90	3.92	4.36	4.30	3.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	117/ 165	4.27	4.30	4.18	4.11	3.90
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 89	****	4.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.25	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	4.50	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.44	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 93	****	4.08	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.83	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.42	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.31	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.06	4.14	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.25	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENEE 302 1  
 Title Prin Electrical Engn  
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F  
 Enrollment: 92  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 604  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 302 3  
 Title Prin Electrical Engrn  
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 605  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	218/1509	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	175/1509	4.77	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	143/1287	4.78	4.07	4.30	4.33	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	602/1459	4.33	3.89	4.22	4.26	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	502/1406	4.09	3.78	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	269/1384	4.34	3.93	4.11	4.15	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	103/1489	4.66	4.05	4.17	4.14	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.91	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	184/1463	4.75	4.19	4.09	4.08	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	319/1438	4.82	4.33	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.48	4.73	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	159/1411	4.72	4.13	4.31	4.29	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	194/1405	4.81	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	73/1236	4.59	4.32	4.00	4.07	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1139/1260	4.02	3.90	4.14	4.22	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1127/1255	4.19	4.13	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	770/1258	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	166/ 184	3.41	3.81	4.16	4.07	3.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	165/ 198	3.65	3.74	4.22	4.17	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	157/ 184	4.02	4.15	4.48	4.52	4.08
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	110/ 177	3.90	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	52/ 165	4.27	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 302 4  
 Title Prin Electrical Engrn  
 Instructor: LaBerge,E F  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 606  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	235/1509	4.75	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	192/1509	4.77	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	240/1287	4.78	4.07	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	378/1459	4.33	3.89	4.22	4.26	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	720/1406	4.09	3.78	4.09	4.12	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	440/1384	4.34	3.93	4.11	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	145/1489	4.66	4.05	4.17	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	292/1506	4.91	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	103/1463	4.75	4.19	4.09	4.08	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	219/1438	4.82	4.33	4.46	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.48	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	351/1411	4.72	4.13	4.31	4.29	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	285/1405	4.81	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	223/1236	4.59	4.32	4.00	4.07	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.02	3.90	4.14	4.22	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.19	4.13	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	535/1258	4.48	4.34	4.38	4.42	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.81	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	106/ 184	3.41	3.81	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	123/ 198	3.65	3.74	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	139/ 184	4.02	4.15	4.48	4.52	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	139/ 177	3.90	3.92	4.36	4.30	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	68/ 165	4.27	4.30	4.18	4.11	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.25	4.54	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.44	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.08	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.83	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.42	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.31	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.06	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.50	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.25	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENEE 302 4  
 Title Prin Electrical Engn  
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 606  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 610 1  
 Title Digital Sig Proc  
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 607  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.07	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	280/1459	4.67	3.89	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	683/1406	4.17	3.78	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1384	4.75	3.93	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	583/1489	4.42	4.05	4.17	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.50	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	700/1438	4.58	4.33	4.46	4.49	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.48	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	520/1411	4.58	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.43	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	100/1236	4.80	4.32	4.00	3.98	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	876/1260	3.89	3.90	4.14	4.21	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	868/1255	4.11	4.13	4.33	4.43	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	895/1258	4.11	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	630/ 873	3.71	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	37/ 184	4.67	3.81	4.16	4.07	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	182/ 198	3.50	3.74	4.22	4.31	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	130/ 184	4.33	4.15	4.48	4.11	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	3.92	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	103/ 165	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	67/ 89	4.00	4.00	4.49	4.39	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.00	4.25	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.50	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.44	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	53/ 93	4.00	4.08	4.06	4.04	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	3.83	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	43/ 47	3.67	4.50	4.51	4.43	3.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	29/ 47	4.00	4.42	4.18	4.03	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	38/ 44	3.67	4.44	4.32	4.45	3.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.16	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	38/ 41	3.50	4.06	4.14	4.08	3.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	4.50	4.31	4.11	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	24/ 37	4.00	4.25	4.05	3.69	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	16/ 30	4.00	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.00

Course-Section: ENEE 610 1  
 Title Digital Sig Proc  
 Instructor: LaBerge, E F  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 607  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 612 1  
 Title Digital Image Processi  
 Instructor: Li,Hualiang  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 608  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1306/1509	3.67	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	454/1459	4.50	3.89	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	502/1406	4.33	3.78	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.93	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1236/1489	3.67	4.05	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.33	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1345/1421	4.00	4.48	4.73	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.33	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.32	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	558/1260	4.33	3.90	4.14	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.13	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	3.81	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	3.81	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	3.74	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	161/ 184	4.00	4.15	4.48	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	4.30	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 89	4.00	4.00	4.49	4.39	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.00	4.25	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 92	4.00	4.44	4.38	4.30	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	53/ 93	4.00	4.08	4.06	4.04	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	3.83	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.50	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 47	4.00	4.42	4.18	4.03	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.44	4.32	4.45	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.16	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.00	4.06	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.11	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	24/ 37	4.00	4.25	4.05	3.69	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.26	5.00



Course-Section: ENEE 612 1  
 Title Digital Image Processi  
 Instructor: Li,Hualiang  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 608  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 620 1  
 Title Prob Random Proc  
 Instructor: Morris,Joel M  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 609  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	3	2	3.38	1410/1509	3.38	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1036/1287	3.88	4.07	4.30	4.22	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	1	2	1	3.14	1405/1459	3.14	3.89	4.22	4.16	3.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1128/1406	3.63	3.78	4.09	4.12	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	734/1384	4.13	3.93	4.11	4.16	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1254/1489	3.63	4.05	4.17	4.14	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.50	4.67	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1338/1463	3.25	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1315/1438	3.75	4.33	4.46	4.49	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1390/1421	3.63	4.48	4.73	4.78	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1333/1411	3.25	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	3	1	2.88	1371/1405	2.88	4.43	4.32	4.33	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1183/1236	2.71	4.32	4.00	3.98	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1081/1260	3.43	3.90	4.14	4.21	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	851/1255	4.14	4.13	4.33	4.43	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	802/1258	4.29	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	3.81	4.03	4.01	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	3.81	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	3.74	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/ 184	4.50	4.15	4.48	4.11	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	141/ 177	4.00	3.92	4.36	4.41	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	103/ 165	4.00	4.30	4.18	4.25	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	67/ 89	4.00	4.00	4.49	4.39	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.00	4.25	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	54/ 90	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	62/ 92	4.33	4.44	4.38	4.30	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	44/ 93	4.33	4.08	4.06	4.04	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 48	4.33	3.83	4.39	4.36	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	30/ 48	4.33	4.33	4.41	4.40	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	34/ 47	4.33	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	4.42	4.18	4.03	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 44	4.67	4.44	4.32	4.45	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	26/ 49	4.25	4.31	4.26	4.16	4.25
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	35/ 41	3.75	4.06	4.14	4.08	3.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	4.50	4.31	4.11	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	24/ 37	4.00	4.25	4.05	3.69	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	16/ 30	4.00	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.00

Course-Section: ENEE 620 1  
 Title Prob Random Proc  
 Instructor: Morris,Joel M  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 609  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	6	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
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.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 630 1  
 Title Solid State Electronic  
 Instructor: Chen,Yung J  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 610  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	424/1509	4.60	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.07	4.30	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1459	4.25	3.89	4.22	4.16	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.78	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	619/1384	4.25	3.93	4.11	4.16	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	823/1489	4.20	4.05	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.33	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.48	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.32	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1260	****	3.90	4.14	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1255	****	4.13	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	****	4.34	4.38	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	2	1	13	6	4.05	1086/1509	4.05	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	4	12	5	3.91	1164/1509	3.91	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	2	0	4	11	5	3.77	1084/1287	3.77	4.07	4.30	4.22	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	1	1	7	8	3	3.55	1292/1459	3.55	3.89	4.22	4.16	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	5	9	4	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.78	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	873/1384	3.95	3.93	4.11	4.16	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1134/1489	3.86	4.05	4.17	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	820/1506	4.77	4.50	4.67	4.71	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	1	13	1	4.00	853/1463	3.25	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	750/1438	3.34	4.33	4.46	4.49	3.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	846/1421	3.67	4.48	4.73	4.78	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	8	6	8	4.00	1051/1411	3.00	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	8	11	4.18	947/1405	4.18	4.43	4.32	4.33	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	804/1236	3.84	4.32	4.00	3.98	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	8	6	5	3.62	1006/1260	3.62	3.90	4.14	4.21	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	3	4	6	8	3.90	992/1255	3.90	4.13	4.33	4.43	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	919/1258	4.05	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	2	3	3	2	2	2.92	831/ 873	2.92	3.81	4.03	4.01	2.92
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	3.81	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 198	****	3.74	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.00	4.49	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 48	****	3.83	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.42	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.31	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.06	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.50	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.25	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.27	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A 12	Required for Majors 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 28
					Electives 2
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	0			

Course-Section: ENEE 660 1  
 Title Systems Eng Principles  
 Instructor: Drilling,Theodo (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 612  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	2	1	13	6	4.05	1086/1509	4.05	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	4	12	5	3.91	1164/1509	3.91	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	2	0	4	11	5	3.77	1084/1287	3.77	4.07	4.30	4.22	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	1	1	7	8	3	3.55	1292/1459	3.55	3.89	4.22	4.16	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	5	9	4	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.78	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	873/1384	3.95	3.93	4.11	4.16	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1134/1489	3.86	4.05	4.17	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	820/1506	4.77	4.50	4.67	4.71	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	1	2	5	0	0	2.50	1442/1463	3.25	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	4	0	1	2	0	2.14	1430/1438	3.34	4.33	4.46	4.49	3.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1417/1421	3.67	4.48	4.73	4.78	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	4	0	2	1	0	2.00	1404/1411	3.00	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	3	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1405	4.18	4.43	4.32	4.33	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1236	3.84	4.32	4.00	3.98	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	8	6	5	3.62	1006/1260	3.62	3.90	4.14	4.21	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	3	4	6	8	3.90	992/1255	3.90	4.13	4.33	4.43	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	919/1258	4.05	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	2	3	3	2	2	2.92	831/ 873	2.92	3.81	4.03	4.01	2.92
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	3.81	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 198	****	3.74	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	4.00	4.49	4.39	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 48	****	3.83	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.42	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	4.44	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.31	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.06	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.50	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.25	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	4.50	4.27	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A 12	Required for Majors 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 28
					Electives 2
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	0			



Course-Section: ENEE 662 1  
 Title Modeling, Sim And Anal  
 Instructor: MacCarthy,John  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 613  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	635/1509	4.48	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	12	4	3.70	1294/1509	3.70	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	698/1287	4.35	4.07	4.30	4.22	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	5	3.91	1077/1459	3.91	3.89	4.22	4.16	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	5	9	3	2	2.90	1362/1406	2.90	3.78	4.09	4.12	2.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	659/1384	4.22	3.93	4.11	4.16	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	2	6	7	3	3.04	1401/1489	3.04	4.05	4.17	4.14	3.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1137/1506	4.43	4.50	4.67	4.71	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	7	9	1	3.40	1295/1463	3.40	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	7	3	9	3.74	1322/1438	3.74	4.33	4.46	4.49	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	828/1421	4.78	4.48	4.73	4.78	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	3	7	6	3.48	1286/1411	3.48	4.13	4.31	4.33	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7	8	3.87	1150/1405	3.87	4.43	4.32	4.33	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	3	6	6	6	3.71	877/1236	3.71	4.32	4.00	3.98	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	6	6	4	3.61	1006/1260	3.61	3.90	4.14	4.21	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	3	3	7	5	3.63	1094/1255	3.63	4.13	4.33	4.43	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	3	6	7	3.79	1060/1258	3.79	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 184	****	3.81	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	****	3.74	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 184	****	4.15	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	****	3.92	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.30	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.00	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.25	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.50	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.44	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.08	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 48	****	3.83	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.42	4.18	4.03	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	4.31	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.06	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.50	4.31	4.11	****

Course-Section: ENEE 662 1  
 Title Modeling, Sim And Anal  
 Instructor: MacCarthy,John  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 613  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 680 1  
 Title Electromag Theory I  
 Instructor: Carter, Gary M  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 614  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.86	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.21	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.07	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	227/1459	4.71	3.89	4.22	4.16	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	187/1406	4.71	3.78	4.09	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	89/1384	4.86	3.93	4.11	4.16	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.05	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.33	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.48	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.13	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.32	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	666/1260	4.20	3.90	4.14	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	822/1255	4.20	4.13	4.33	4.43	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	3.81	4.03	4.01	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.00	4.49	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.44	4.38	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 685 1  
 Title Intro Comm Network  
 Instructor: Choa,Fow-sen  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 615  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.21	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.07	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	3.89	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.78	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	4.75	3.93	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.05	4.17	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.33	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.48	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	885/1411	4.25	4.13	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.32	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	621/1260	4.25	3.90	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.13	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.50	5.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.25	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.44	4.38	4.30	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	53/ 93	4.00	4.08	4.06	4.04	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 48	3.00	3.83	4.39	4.36	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.33	4.41	4.40	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.50	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.42	4.18	4.03	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.31	4.26	4.16	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.06	4.14	4.08	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.50	4.31	4.11	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.25	4.05	3.69	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.26	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 718 1  
 Title Topics in Sig Processi  
 Instructor: Adali,Tulay  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 616  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1164/1509	3.90	4.21	4.26	4.25	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	4.07	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	0	3.10	1411/1459	3.10	3.89	4.22	4.16	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	3	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	3.78	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1359/1384	2.75	3.93	4.11	4.16	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1236/1489	3.67	4.05	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	3.40	1489/1506	3.40	4.50	4.67	4.71	3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.19	4.09	4.15	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1268/1438	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.49	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	2	0	5	3.67	1386/1421	3.67	4.48	4.73	4.78	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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