Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 1		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	15
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn				Questionnaires:	2
Instructor:	Pritchard,Kevin					

| 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	1	1	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.38	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.33	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.40	4.13	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1127/1327	3.50	4.22	4.16	4.23	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	479/1435	4.50	4.21	4.20	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.86	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1245/1437	3.50	4.05	4.12	4.14	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1319/1386	3.50	4.23	4.48	4.53	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.56	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1058/1379	4.00	4.19	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	688/1379	4.50	4.25	4.36	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1205/1236	2.50	3.85	4.08	4.18	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/200	5.00	5.00	4.28	4.44	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/205	5.00	3.00	4.29	4.44	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	201/201	2.00	2.00	4.51	4.59	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/202	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.48	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/196	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.37	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 302 1		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	15
Title:	Prin Electrical Engn				Questionnaires:	2
Instructor:	Pritchard,Kevin					

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	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	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	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 621 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 6
Title: Det Est Theory I		Questionnaires: 6
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	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	1425/1449	2.83	4.38	4.33	4.41	2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1411/1446	3.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1251/1256	2.67	4.47	4.34	4.30	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1377/1402	2.83	4.24	4.27	4.26	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1272/1358	3.20	4.40	4.13	4.18	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1325/1327	2.17	4.22	4.16	4.29	2.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1318/1435	3.33	4.21	4.20	4.23	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1019/1446	4.50	4.86	4.67	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1364/1437	3.00	4.05	4.12	4.17	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1341/1386	3.33	4.23	4.48	4.47	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1351/1390	3.83	4.56	4.74	4.77	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	1340/1379	3.00	4.19	4.34	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1326/1379	3.17	4.25	4.36	4.35	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1205/1236	2.50	3.85	4.08	3.94	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1052/1121	3.00	4.10	4.18	4.29	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1063/1122	3.17	4.17	4.36	4.44	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1078/1121	3.00	4.36	4.40	4.52	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 621 1	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment: 6
Title:	Det Est Theory I			Questionnaires: 6
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															

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 622 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	5
Title:	Inform Theory		Questionnaires:	5
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M			

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	460/1449	4.60	4.38	4.33	4.41	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	440/1446	4.60	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	644/1256	4.40	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1149/1402	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	285/1358	4.60	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1327	4.40	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1143/1435	3.80	4.21	4.20	4.23	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	949/1446	4.60	4.86	4.67	4.81	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1172/1437	3.67	4.05	4.12	4.17	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1256/1386	3.80	4.23	4.48	4.47	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1290/1390	4.20	4.56	4.74	4.77	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1172/1379	3.80	4.19	4.34	4.34	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1163/1379	3.80	4.25	4.36	4.35	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	954/1236	3.67	3.85	4.08	3.94	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	727/1121	4.00	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	631/1122	4.40	4.17	4.36	4.44	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	793/1121	4.20	4.36	4.40	4.52	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	425/790	4.00	4.39	4.06	4.08	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 622 1		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	5
Title:	Inform Theory				Questionnaires:	5
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M					

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 631 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 4
Title:	Semicond Devices		Questionnaires: 3
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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1304/1449	3.67	4.38	4.33	4.41	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1273/1446	3.67	4.40	4.29	4.30	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1256	4.33	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1363/1402	3.00	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.40	4.13	4.18	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	404/1327	4.50	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	970/1435	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.86	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1245/1437	3.50	4.05	4.12	4.17	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1362/1386	3.00	4.23	4.48	4.47	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1379/1390	3.33	4.56	4.74	4.77	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1340/1379	3.00	4.19	4.34	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1303/1379	3.33	4.25	4.36	4.35	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	709/1236	4.00	3.85	4.08	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1052/1121	3.00	4.10	4.18	4.29	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1082/1122	3.00	4.17	4.36	4.44	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1121	4.50	4.36	4.40	4.52	4.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	204/205	1.00	3.00	4.29	3.54	1.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 631 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 4
Title: Semicond Devices		Questionnaires: 3
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														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	58/64	3.00	3.00	4.25	4.32	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	68/75	3.00	3.00	4.32	4.37	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	25/34	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	29/35	3.00	3.00	4.15	3.87	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	29/30	2.00	2.00	4.09	3.81	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	29/30	2.00	2.00	4.04	3.79	2.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	29/31	3.00	4.00	4.34	4.38	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	15/18	3.00	3.00	4.13	4.22	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	2	Major	3
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	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 661 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	System Archit And Design			Questionnaires:	19
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	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	106/1449	4.93	4.38	4.33	4.41	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	285/1446	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1256	****	4.47	4.34	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	143/1402	4.86	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	916/1358	3.93	4.40	4.13	4.18	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	452/1327	4.46	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	257/1435	4.71	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.86	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	470/1437	4.40	4.05	4.12	4.17	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.23	4.48	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.56	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	187/1379	4.86	4.19	4.34	4.34	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	239/1379	4.86	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	331/1236	4.50	3.85	4.08	3.94	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	396/1121	4.50	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	537/1122	4.50	4.17	4.36	4.44	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	427/1121	4.71	4.36	4.40	4.52	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	154/790	4.62	4.39	4.06	4.08	4.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 661 01	Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	25
Title:	System Archit And Design			Questionnaires:	19
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
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	5.00	4.28	3.91	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/205	****	3.00	4.29	3.54	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	2.00	4.51	4.10	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	5.00	4.42	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	5.00	4.25	4.16	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.00	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	3.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/34	****	4.00	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	2.00	4.09	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	2.00	4.04	3.79	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.92	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	4.00	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/18	****	3.00	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 661 01
Title:	System Archit And Design
Instructor:	Taylor,Richard

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	7	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 663 01					Term - Spring 2011						Enrollment: 23		
Title:	System Implem Integratio											Questionnaires: 23		
Instructor:	Martin,Paul B.													

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	783/1449	4.36	4.38	4.33	4.41	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	637/1446	4.45	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	599/1402	4.45	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	746/1358	4.14	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	712/1327	4.19	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	391/1435	4.59	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	21	4.82	707/1446	4.82	4.86	4.67	4.81	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	516/1437	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.17	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	516/1386	4.73	4.23	4.48	4.47	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	633/1390	4.86	4.56	4.74	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	529/1379	4.59	4.19	4.34	4.34	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	666/1379	4.52	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	331/1236	4.50	3.85	4.08	3.94	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	700/1121	4.10	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	631/1122	4.40	4.17	4.36	4.44	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	591/1121	4.50	4.36	4.40	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	7	9	4.28	317/790	4.28	4.39	4.06	4.08	4.28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 663 01
Title:	System Implem Integratio
Instructor:	Martin,Paul B.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.00	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	3.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.02	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	4.00	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.00	4.15	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	2.00	4.04	3.79	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	7	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENEE 683 1	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 7
Title: Lasers		Questionnaires: 6
Instructor: Okusaga,Olukayo		

| 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	1	5	4.83	192/1449	4.83	4.38	4.33	4.41	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	158/1446	4.83	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	179/1402	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	113/1358	4.83	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1327	5.00	4.22	4.16	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	479/1435	4.50	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1446	4.83	4.86	4.67	4.81	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1437	5.00	4.05	4.12	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.23	4.48	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.56	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	310/1379	4.80	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	436/1236	4.40	3.85	4.08	3.94	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	396/1121	4.50	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	857/1122	4.00	4.17	4.36	4.44	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1121	4.50	4.36	4.40	4.52	4.50
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 683 1
Title:	Lasers
Instructor:	Okusaga,Olukayo

Term - Spring 2011

| Enrollment: | 7 |
| Questionnaires: | 6 |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 684 01
Title:	Intro Photonics
Instructor:	Yan,Li

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	460/1449	4.60	4.38	4.33	4.41	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	704/1446	4.40	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1256	4.80	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	827/1358	4.00	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1327	4.33	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	970/1435	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.86	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.05	4.12	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	707/1386	4.60	4.23	4.48	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	787/1390	4.80	4.56	4.74	4.77	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	770/1379	4.40	4.19	4.34	4.34	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	3.85	4.08	3.94	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	727/1121	4.00	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	537/1122	4.50	4.17	4.36	4.44	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	855/1121	4.00	4.36	4.40	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	4.39	4.06	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 684 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment: 6
Title:	Intro Photonics					Questionnaires: 5
Instructor:	Yan,Li					

Questions						Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			NR	NA	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	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 691 01		Term - Spring 2011			Enrollment:	6
Title:	Special Topics Elec Engr					Questionnaires:	5
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M						

| 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	460/1449	4.60	4.38	4.33	4.41	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	440/1446	4.60	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1402	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	483/1358	4.40	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	144/1327	4.80	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	970/1435	4.00	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.86	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	470/1437	4.40	4.05	4.12	4.17	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	707/1386	4.60	4.23	4.48	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1070/1390	4.60	4.56	4.74	4.77	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	518/1379	4.60	4.19	4.34	4.34	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1379	4.60	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1236	4.33	3.85	4.08	3.94	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1121	4.80	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	275/1122	4.80	4.17	4.36	4.44	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1121	4.80	4.36	4.40	4.52	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/790	****	4.39	4.06	4.08	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 691 01
Title:	Special Topics Elec Engr
Instructor:	Morris,Joel M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.00	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	3.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 718 01		Term - Spring 2011				Enrollment: 8
Title:	Topics In Sig Processing						Questionnaires: 8
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	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	158/1449	4.88	4.38	4.33	4.41	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	241/1446	4.75	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1402	4.88	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	93/1358	4.88	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	106/1327	4.88	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	359/1435	4.63	4.21	4.20	4.23	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	586/1446	4.88	4.86	4.67	4.81	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	448/1437	4.43	4.05	4.12	4.17	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	462/1386	4.75	4.23	4.48	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.56	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	491/1379	4.63	4.19	4.34	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	211/1379	4.88	4.25	4.36	4.35	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	553/1236	4.25	3.85	4.08	3.94	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.10	4.18	4.29	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	322/1122	4.75	4.17	4.36	4.44	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	134/790	4.67	4.39	4.06	4.08	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENEE 718 01		Term - Spring 2011		Enrollment:	8
Title:	Topics In Sig Processing				Questionnaires:	8
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
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/31	5.00	4.00	4.34	4.38	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	3.00	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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