

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	114
Questionnaires:	91

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	17	67	4.68	419/1528	4.68	4.21	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	12	72	4.75	259/1527	4.75	4.07	4.28	4.27	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	21	61	4.59	479/1333	4.59	4.19	4.34	4.34	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	1	4	17	42	4.56	419/1495	4.56	4.11	4.25	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	22	4	2	14	17	28	3.97	895/1439	3.97	3.85	4.11	4.13	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	22	0	2	9	13	42	4.44	477/1425	4.44	4.18	4.12	4.17	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	9	16	63	4.61	340/1508	4.61	4.17	4.18	4.17	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	3	84	4.94	340/1526	4.94	4.95	4.66	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	2	11	64	4.81	122/1490	4.81	4.10	4.11	4.11	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	11	73	4.80	385/1428	4.80	4.44	4.49	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	82	4.91	516/1436	4.91	4.68	4.74	4.74	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	6	21	60	4.62	477/1427	4.62	4.09	4.32	4.31	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	6	14	66	4.67	475/1425	4.67	4.10	4.34	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	3	6	16	57	4.46	366/1291	4.46	3.61	4.05	4.09	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	****/1271	****	3.62	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	73	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	****/1276	****	3.88	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	73	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	****/1273	****	4.15	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	73	7	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	****/922	****	3.59	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	114
Questionnaires:	91

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	2	5	9	18	14	3.77	159/198	3.77	3.64	4.16	4.26	3.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	4	12	11	21	4.02	156/208	4.02	4.09	4.27	4.31	4.02
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	1	5	8	34	4.56	124/194	4.56	4.58	4.56	4.59	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	1	3	4	1	13	25	4.15	147/194	4.15	4.15	4.37	4.37	4.15
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	1	2	10	34	4.64	38/176	4.64	4.64	4.23	4.33	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	90	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	90	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	90	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	90	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	90	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	90	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	90	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	90	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	90	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	90	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	90	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	90	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 302 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 114
Title: Prin Electrical Engn		Questionnaires: 91
Instructor: LaBerge,E F		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 3	A 22 Required for Majors 77	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 31		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 8	C 23 General 0	Under-grad 91	Non-major 91
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 15	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0 Electives 0 P 0 I 0 Other 0 ? 14	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 610 1
Title:	Digital Sig Proc
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	1	3	3	3.36	1441/1528	3.36	4.21	4.31	4.45	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	1446/1527	3.27	4.07	4.28	4.36	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1215/1333	3.60	4.19	4.34	4.39	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1331/1495	3.60	4.11	4.25	4.33	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1108/1439	3.70	3.85	4.11	4.24	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1262/1425	3.40	4.18	4.12	4.28	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1358/1508	3.40	4.17	4.18	4.25	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1295/1490	3.44	4.10	4.11	4.16	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	0	5	3.73	1322/1428	3.73	4.44	4.49	4.56	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	1405/1436	3.82	4.68	4.74	4.83	3.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	2	1	2	2.82	1397/1427	2.82	4.09	4.32	4.36	2.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	1	2	2.64	1398/1425	2.64	4.10	4.34	4.34	2.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	3	2	1	2	2.80	1237/1291	2.80	3.61	4.05	3.99	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	4	1	3.30	1144/1271	3.30	3.62	4.16	4.27	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1152/1276	3.50	3.88	4.33	4.43	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1207/1273	3.30	4.15	4.38	4.52	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	811/922	3.29	3.59	4.02	4.00	3.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 610 1
Title:	Digital Sig Proc
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	4 A 6	Required for Majors	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1 F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	1

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 620 1
Title:	Prob Random Proc
Instructor:	Adali,Tulay

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	752/1528	4.41	4.21	4.31	4.45	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	988/1527	4.17	4.07	4.28	4.36	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	889/1333	4.18	4.19	4.34	4.39	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	844/1495	4.25	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	824/1439	4.06	3.85	4.11	4.24	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	669/1425	4.25	4.18	4.12	4.28	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	895/1508	4.17	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	778/1490	4.17	4.10	4.11	4.16	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	534/1428	4.72	4.44	4.49	4.56	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	742/1436	4.83	4.68	4.74	4.83	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1060/1427	4.06	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	915/1425	4.28	4.10	4.34	4.34	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1106/1291	3.36	3.61	4.05	3.99	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	2	6	3	3.40	1116/1271	3.40	3.62	4.16	4.27	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	904/1276	4.07	3.88	4.33	4.43	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	724/1273	4.40	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	659/922	3.67	3.59	4.02	4.00	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 620 1
Title:	Prob Random Proc
Instructor:	Adali,Tulay

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	3.64	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	4.09	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.58	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.15	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/176	****	4.64	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 620 1
Title:	Prob Random Proc
Instructor:	Adali,Tulay

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	4	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	9	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 623 1
Title:	Commun Theory I
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	521/1528	4.60	4.21	4.31	4.45	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	453/1527	4.60	4.07	4.28	4.36	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	458/1333	4.60	4.19	4.34	4.39	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1495	4.60	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	292/1439	4.60	3.85	4.11	4.24	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	726/1425	4.20	4.18	4.12	4.28	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	586/1508	4.40	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	978/1526	4.60	4.95	4.66	4.81	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	266/1490	4.60	4.10	4.11	4.16	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	735/1428	4.60	4.44	4.49	4.56	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1436	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.83	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	772/1427	4.40	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	556/1425	4.60	4.10	4.34	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1291	4.75	3.61	4.05	3.99	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	204/1271	4.80	3.62	4.16	4.27	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	696/1276	4.40	3.88	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1273	4.60	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	158/922	4.67	3.59	4.02	4.00	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 623 1
Title:	Commun Theory I
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.09	4.27	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 623 1		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	5							
Title:	Commun Theory I					Questionnaires:	5							
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F													
			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

? 0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 630 1
Title:	Solid State Electronics
Instructor:	Chen, Yung J

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	835/1528	4.33	4.21	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1434/1527	3.33	4.07	4.28	4.36	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1279/1333	3.33	4.19	4.34	4.39	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1410/1495	3.33	4.11	4.25	4.33	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1413/1439	2.67	3.85	4.11	4.24	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	891/1425	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	911/1490	4.00	4.10	4.11	4.16	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	637/1428	4.67	4.44	4.49	4.56	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1043/1436	4.67	4.68	4.74	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1425	4.33	4.10	4.34	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1116/1291	3.33	3.61	4.05	3.99	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1195/1271	3.00	3.62	4.16	4.27	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1257/1276	2.50	3.88	4.33	4.43	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	947/1273	4.00	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	912/922	2.00	3.59	4.02	4.00	2.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 630 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 8
Title: Solid State Electronics		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Chen, Yung J		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 660 01
Title:	Systems Eng Principles
Instructor:	MacCarthy,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	2	8	8	9	4	3.16	1470/1528	3.16	4.21	4.31	4.45	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	5	8	4	5	9	3.16	1467/1527	3.16	4.07	4.28	4.36	3.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	5	2	5	8	10	3.53	1234/1333	3.53	4.19	4.34	4.39	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	3	4	8	10	5	3.33	1410/1495	3.33	4.11	4.25	4.33	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	4	6	8	7	3.19	1331/1439	3.19	3.85	4.11	4.24	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	5	6	6	10	3.59	1175/1425	3.59	4.18	4.12	4.28	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	2	5	3	11	8	3.62	1285/1508	3.62	4.17	4.18	4.25	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	7	9	7	0	2.84	1439/1490	2.84	4.10	4.11	4.16	2.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	7	7	11	4	3.41	1373/1428	3.41	4.44	4.49	4.56	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	1	11	15	4.31	1299/1436	4.31	4.68	4.74	4.83	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	9	9	6	2	2.83	1396/1427	2.83	4.09	4.32	4.36	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	4	5	7	6	3.03	1370/1425	3.03	4.10	4.34	4.34	3.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	4	6	4	3	6	3.04	1190/1291	3.04	3.61	4.05	3.99	3.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	6	2	8	7	2	2.88	1221/1271	2.88	3.62	4.16	4.27	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	1	8	6	6	3.36	1189/1276	3.36	3.88	4.33	4.43	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	7	5	8	3.52	1163/1273	3.52	4.15	4.38	4.52	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	749/922	3.45	3.59	4.02	4.00	3.45

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 660 01
Title:	Systems Eng Principles
Instructor:	MacCarthy,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	36

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/208	****	4.09	4.27	4.40	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 25	Graduate 21 Major 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 15 Non-major 27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	21	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives 4	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 5		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 662 01
Title:	Modeling, Sim And Analy
Instructor:	MacCarthy,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	1140/1528	4.00	4.21	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	5	3.72	1326/1527	3.72	4.07	4.28	4.36	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	7	4	3.72	1179/1333	3.72	4.19	4.34	4.39	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	7	3	3.61	1326/1495	3.61	4.11	4.25	4.33	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	4	5	2	3.00	1361/1439	3.00	3.85	4.11	4.24	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	891/1425	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	6	5	3.56	1305/1508	3.56	4.17	4.18	4.25	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	8	5	0	3.29	1353/1490	3.29	4.10	4.11	4.16	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	8	6	3	3.61	1343/1428	3.61	4.44	4.49	4.56	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1229/1436	4.44	4.68	4.74	4.83	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	7	4	4	3.50	1300/1427	3.50	4.09	4.32	4.36	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	4	5	3.61	1270/1425	3.61	4.10	4.34	4.34	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	5	0	6	3.18	1167/1291	3.18	3.61	4.05	3.99	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	4	2	2	2.85	1224/1271	2.85	3.62	4.16	4.27	2.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1198/1276	3.31	3.88	4.33	4.43	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1110/1273	3.69	4.15	4.38	4.52	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	857/922	3.00	3.59	4.02	4.00	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 662 01
Title:	Modeling, Sim And Analy
Instructor:	MacCarthy,John

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	170/198	3.50	3.64	4.16	4.54	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	139/208	4.17	4.09	4.27	4.40	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	120/194	4.60	4.58	4.56	4.58	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/194	****	4.15	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/176	****	4.64	4.23	4.66	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	11	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 670 01
Title:	Syst Engr Proj
Instructor:	Highland, Freder

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	348/1528	4.73	4.21	4.31	4.45	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	526/1527	4.55	4.07	4.28	4.36	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	257/1495	4.73	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1439	4.67	3.85	4.11	4.24	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	199/1425	4.73	4.18	4.12	4.28	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	722/1508	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	266/1490	4.60	4.10	4.11	4.16	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	270/1428	4.88	4.44	4.49	4.56	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.09	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1425	4.88	4.10	4.34	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	405/1291	4.43	3.61	4.05	3.99	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	280/1271	4.71	3.62	4.16	4.27	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1276	4.86	3.88	4.33	4.43	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1273	4.71	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.59	4.02	4.00	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 670 01
Title:	Syst Engr Proj
Instructor:	Highland, Freder

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.64	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.09	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.58	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.15	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.64	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	5	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 670 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 11
Title: Syst Engr Proj		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Highland, Freder		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														

	P	0		to be significant
	I	0	Other	0
	?	1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 680 1
Title:	Electromag Theory I
Instructor:	Yan,Li

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	0	4	3.83	1265/1528	3.83	4.21	4.31	4.45	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.07	4.28	4.36	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	769/1333	4.33	4.19	4.34	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1495	4.25	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1002/1439	3.83	3.85	4.11	4.24	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.18	4.12	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	344/1490	4.50	4.10	4.11	4.16	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	843/1427	4.33	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1076/1425	4.00	4.10	4.34	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1276/1291	2.00	3.61	4.05	3.99	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1037/1271	3.60	3.62	4.16	4.27	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	696/1276	4.40	3.88	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	724/1273	4.40	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.59	4.02	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 680 1
Title:	Electromag Theory I
Instructor:	Yan,Li

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 728 01
Title:	Topics In Communications
Instructor:	Chang,Chen-i

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	453/1527	4.60	4.07	4.28	4.36	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	177/1495	4.80	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1439	4.80	3.85	4.11	4.24	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	249/1425	4.67	4.18	4.12	4.28	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1508	5.00	4.17	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.95	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	156/1490	4.75	4.10	4.11	4.16	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.09	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.10	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1291	4.75	3.61	4.05	3.99	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	780/1271	4.00	3.62	4.16	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	591/1276	4.50	3.88	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	408/1273	4.75	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	158/922	4.67	3.59	4.02	4.00	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 728 01
Title:	Topics In Communications
Instructor:	Chang,Chen-i

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	3.64	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	4.09	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.58	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.15	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.64	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 728 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 5
Title: Topics In Communications		Questionnaires: 5
Instructor: Chang,Chein-i		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 4 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 1 Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2 F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant