Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 95
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn					Questionnaires: 56
Instructor:	Yan,Li					

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	6	12	14	13	9	3.13	1558/1589	3.13	4.27	4.32	4.33	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	19	8	17	8	2	2.37	1582/1589	2.37	4.07	4.29	4.26	2.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	14	10	13	12	3	2.62	1384/1391	2.62	4.23	4.34	4.30	2.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	13	10	9	11	7	2	2.54	1544/1552	2.54	4.20	4.25	4.24	2.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	15	5	5	10	7	10	3.32	1385/1495	3.32	4.12	4.14	4.11	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	16	8	9	8	7	5	2.78	1439/1457	2.78	4.26	4.15	4.13	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	14	12	15	7	4	2.52	1554/1572	2.52	4.13	4.21	4.18	2.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	13	38	4.75	844/1589	4.75	4.74	4.66	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	22	14	9	2	0	1.81	1567/1569	1.81	3.76	4.13	4.10	1.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	11	18	12	7	3.06	1507/1530	3.06	4.20	4.49	4.49	3.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	9	6	19	10	10	3.11	1529/1533	3.11	4.62	4.75	4.75	3.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	21	13	15	3	2	2.11	1524/1528	2.11	3.81	4.35	4.33	2.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	21	14	11	6	1	2.09	1523/1529	2.09	3.87	4.36	4.34	2.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	43	6	3	2	0	0	1.64	****/1393	****	3.84	4.06	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	8	3	4	2	1	2.17	1331/1337	2.17	3.58	4.17	4.20	2.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	7	6	2	3	1	2.21	1327/1331	2.21	4.01	4.35	4.35	2.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	12	2	3	1	0	1.61	1332/1333	1.61	3.99	4.40	4.41	1.61
4. Were special techniques successful	37	11	7	0	1	0	0	1.25	****/1014	****	4.11	4.05	4.04	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 01		Term - Fall 2012									Enrollment: 95		
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn											Questionnaires: 56		
Instructor:	Yan,Li													

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	9	1	9	7	13	13	4	2.91	178/180	2.91	2.91	4.20	4.08	2.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	20	6	16	4	1	2.15	192/194	2.15	2.15	4.17	4.05	2.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	8	5	9	11	14	3.38	173/178	3.38	3.38	4.47	4.42	3.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	15	11	8	7	6	2.53	180/181	2.53	2.53	4.40	4.31	2.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	21	8	13	2	3	2.11	165/165	2.11	2.11	4.12	3.94	2.11
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/62	****	5.00	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/65	****	5.00	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/61	****	4.50	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/61	****	4.63	4.19	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/32	****	4.33	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	2	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/39	****	3.67	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/22	****	4.00	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/33	****	4.00	4.42	4.25	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 95
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn					Questionnaires: 56
Instructor:	Yan,Li					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/19	****	3.67	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/16	****	4.00	4.25	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	24	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	56
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 612 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 10
Title:	Digital Image Processing			Questionnaires: 9
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	871/1589	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1082/1589	4.11	4.07	4.29	4.33	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1391	****	4.23	4.34	4.40	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	457/1552	4.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	416/1495	4.50	4.12	4.14	4.18	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	90/1457	4.89	4.26	4.15	4.30	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1287/1572	3.75	4.13	4.21	4.29	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1500/1589	4.00	4.74	4.66	4.79	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1107/1569	3.88	3.76	4.13	4.18	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1426/1530	3.78	4.20	4.49	4.55	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	643/1533	4.89	4.62	4.75	4.82	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1423/1528	3.44	3.81	4.35	4.38	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	1444/1529	3.33	3.87	4.36	4.38	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1240/1393	3.29	3.84	4.06	3.91	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1331/1337	2.20	3.58	4.17	4.29	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	989/1331	4.00	4.01	4.35	4.51	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1150/1333	3.75	3.99	4.40	4.51	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 612 01		Term - Fall 2012						Enrollment: 10				
Title:	Digital Image Processing								Questionnaires: 9				
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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	4.11	4.05	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 620 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 14
Title: Prob Random Proc		Questionnaires: 11
Instructor: Adali,Tulay		

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	0	0	2	8	4.45	713/1589	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	689/1589	4.45	4.07	4.29	4.33	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	8	4.18	937/1391	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.40	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	604/1552	4.44	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	531/1495	4.40	4.12	4.14	4.18	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	400/1457	4.50	4.26	4.15	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	815/1572	4.27	4.13	4.21	4.29	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	730/1589	4.80	4.74	4.66	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	288/1569	4.60	3.76	4.13	4.18	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	951/1530	4.45	4.20	4.49	4.55	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.62	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	869/1528	4.36	3.81	4.35	4.38	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	689/1529	4.55	3.87	4.36	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	796/1393	4.00	3.84	4.06	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1021/1337	3.75	3.58	4.17	4.29	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	989/1331	4.00	4.01	4.35	4.51	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	802/1333	4.38	3.99	4.40	4.51	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	137/1014	4.75	4.11	4.05	4.13	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 620 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 14				
Title:	Prob Random Proc										Questionnaires: 11				
Instructor:	Adali,Tulay														

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	2.91	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/194	****	2.15	4.17	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	5.00	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/65	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.61	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/63	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.42	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	49/61	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.33	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	13/61	4.75	4.63	4.19	4.22	4.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	19/32	4.33	4.33	4.30	4.67	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	14/29	4.33	4.33	4.15	4.17	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	27/39	3.67	3.67	4.00	4.10	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	13/22	4.00	4.00	4.12	4.54	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	24/33	4.00	4.00	4.42	4.63	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	17/19	3.67	3.67	4.44	4.06	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 620 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	14
Title:	Prob Random Proc			Questionnaires:	11
Instructor:	Adali,Tulay				

				Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	10/16	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 630 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 9
Title:	Solid State Electronics					Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Choa,Fow-sen					

| 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	2	3	3	4.13	1089/1589	4.13	4.27	4.32	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1284/1589	3.88	4.07	4.29	4.33	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1061/1391	4.00	4.23	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1307/1495	3.50	4.12	4.14	4.18	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1216/1457	3.63	4.26	4.15	4.30	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	685/1572	4.38	4.13	4.21	4.29	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1589	4.75	4.74	4.66	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	5	0	3.57	1333/1569	3.57	3.76	4.13	4.18	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1319/1530	4.00	4.20	4.49	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1154/1533	4.63	4.62	4.75	4.82	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1333/1528	3.75	3.81	4.35	4.38	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1381/1529	3.63	3.87	4.36	4.38	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1195/1393	3.40	3.84	4.06	3.91	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	958/1337	3.86	3.58	4.17	4.29	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	696/1331	4.43	4.01	4.35	4.51	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	765/1333	4.43	3.99	4.40	4.51	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	341/1014	4.33	4.11	4.05	4.13	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 630 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 9
Title:	Solid State Electronics			Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Choa,Fow-sen			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/62	5.00	5.00	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/65	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.61	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/63	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.42	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/61	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.33	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/61	4.50	4.63	4.19	4.22	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	4.33	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	4.33	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/39	****	3.67	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.00	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/33	****	4.00	4.42	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	3.67	4.44	4.06	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 630 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	9
Title:	Solid State Electronics			Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Choa,Fow-sen				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/16	****	4.00	4.25	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	2	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 662 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment:	19
Title:	Modeling, Sim And Analy					Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	MacCarthy,John						

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	3	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	569/1589	4.56	4.27	4.32	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	943/1589	4.25	4.07	4.29	4.33	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	376/1391	4.69	4.23	4.34	4.40	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	668/1552	4.40	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	683/1495	4.27	4.12	4.14	4.18	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	732/1457	4.20	4.26	4.15	4.30	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	843/1572	4.25	4.13	4.21	4.29	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1011/1589	4.60	4.74	4.66	4.79	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1143/1569	3.83	3.76	4.13	4.18	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	990/1530	4.43	4.20	4.49	4.55	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.62	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1238/1528	3.93	3.81	4.35	4.38	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	945/1529	4.31	3.87	4.36	4.38	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	748/1393	4.09	3.84	4.06	3.91	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	788/1337	4.08	3.58	4.17	4.29	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	967/1331	4.08	4.01	4.35	4.51	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	896/1333	4.23	3.99	4.40	4.51	4.23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 662 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment:	19
Title:	Modeling, Sim And Analy			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	MacCarthy,John				

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	875/1014	3.40	4.11	4.05	4.13	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	6	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 664 01	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 9
Title: Advanced Systems Archite		**Questionnaires: 7**
Instructor: Taylor,Richard		

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	1	5	4.83	223/1589	4.83	4.27	4.32	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	200/1589	4.83	4.07	4.29	4.33	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.23	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	668/1552	4.40	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	609/1495	4.33	4.12	4.14	4.18	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	248/1457	4.67	4.26	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	152/1572	4.83	4.13	4.21	4.29	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	369/1569	4.50	3.76	4.13	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	346/1530	4.83	4.20	4.49	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.62	4.75	4.82	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	248/1528	4.83	3.81	4.35	4.38	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	530/1529	4.67	3.87	4.36	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	674/1393	4.17	3.84	4.06	3.91	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	226/1337	4.80	3.58	4.17	4.29	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.01	4.35	4.51	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1333	5.00	3.99	4.40	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	791/1014	3.60	4.11	4.05	4.13	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 664 01		Term - Fall 2012			Enrollment: 9
Title:	Advanced Systems Archite					Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Taylor,Richard					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	2.15	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	3.38	4.47	4.63	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	5.00	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	5.00	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	5.00	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.50	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/61	****	4.63	4.19	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 670 1	Term - Fall 2012	Enrollment: 15
Title: Systems Engineering Proj		Questionnaires: 13
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	316/1589	4.75	4.27	4.32	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	400/1589	4.67	4.07	4.29	4.33	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1391	4.71	4.23	4.34	4.40	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	177/1552	4.80	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1495	4.67	4.12	4.14	4.18	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	248/1457	4.67	4.26	4.15	4.30	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	233/1572	4.75	4.13	4.21	4.29	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1125/1569	3.86	3.76	4.13	4.18	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	399/1530	4.80	4.20	4.49	4.55	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	786/1533	4.83	4.62	4.75	4.82	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	322/1528	4.78	3.81	4.35	4.38	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	852/1529	4.40	3.87	4.36	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	290/1393	4.57	3.84	4.06	3.91	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	663/1337	4.25	3.58	4.17	4.29	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1331	4.63	4.01	4.35	4.51	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	702/1333	4.50	3.99	4.40	4.51	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 670 1		Term - Fall 2012				Enrollment: 15
Title: Systems Engineering Proj						Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Highland,Freder						

			Frequencies					**Instructor**		**Course**	**Org**	**UMBC**	**Level**	**Sect**
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	**Mean**	**Rank**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**	**Mean**
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	224/1014	4.56	4.11	4.05	4.13	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 680 01	Term - Fall 2012		Enrollment: 5
Title:	Electromag Theory I			Questionnaires: 4
Instructor:	Carter,Gary M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org 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	2	1	4.00	1182/1589	4.00	4.27	4.32	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	4.07	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	301/1391	4.75	4.23	4.34	4.40	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	509/1552	4.50	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	899/1495	4.00	4.12	4.14	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	169/1457	4.75	4.26	4.15	4.30	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	843/1572	4.25	4.13	4.21	4.29	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.74	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	957/1569	4.00	3.76	4.13	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1169/1530	4.25	4.20	4.49	4.55	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1261/1533	4.50	4.62	4.75	4.82	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1461/1528	3.25	3.81	4.35	4.38	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1174/1529	4.00	3.87	4.36	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1222/1393	3.33	3.84	4.06	3.91	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1145/1337	3.50	3.58	4.17	4.29	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1141/1331	3.75	4.01	4.35	4.51	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1007/1333	4.00	3.99	4.40	4.51	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 680 01		Term - Fall 2012										Enrollment: 5
Title: Electromag Theory I												Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Carter,Gary M												

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	554/1014	4.00	4.11	4.05	4.13	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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