

Course-Section: ENEE 206 0101  
 Title BASIC CIRCUIT THEORY  
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 618  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1353/1504	3.47	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1365/1503	3.35	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	1	2	3.33	1193/1290	3.35	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	3.86	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1368/1421	3.26	4.08	4.00	3.90	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	782/1365	3.42	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	990/1485	3.69	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1439/1483	2.80	4.07	4.06	4.02	2.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1238/1425	3.64	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1296/1426	4.02	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1410/1418	2.41	4.29	4.25	4.22	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1348/1416	2.70	4.34	4.26	4.24	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1125/1199	2.53	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1224/1312	2.58	4.12	4.00	3.98	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	910/1303	3.38	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	219/ 233	3.08	4.07	4.09	4.30	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	224/ 244	3.25	4.12	4.09	4.24	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	125/ 227	4.08	4.49	4.40	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	4.50	4.40	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 207	4.17	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 206 0102  
 Title BASIC CIRCUIT THEORY  
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 619  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	6	2	3.44	1380/1504	3.47	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	4	3	3.38	1355/1503	3.35	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	5	4	3.38	1183/1290	3.35	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1372/1453	3.86	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	957/1421	3.26	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1323/1365	3.42	4.11	4.08	4.00	2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	5	3	3.38	1319/1485	3.69	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	6	4	0	3.00	1379/1483	2.80	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	6	4	3	3.44	1322/1425	3.64	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	1349/1426	4.02	4.72	4.69	4.71	3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	3	5	1	2.81	1360/1418	2.41	4.29	4.25	4.22	2.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	4	3	1	2.56	1372/1416	2.70	4.34	4.26	4.24	2.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	3	2	4	0	1	2.40	1153/1199	2.53	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1247/1312	2.58	4.12	4.00	3.98	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1230/1303	3.38	4.39	4.24	4.23	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1194/1299	3.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	3	2	5	1	3.17	213/ 233	3.08	4.07	4.09	4.30	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	196/ 244	3.25	4.12	4.09	4.24	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	198/ 227	4.08	4.49	4.40	4.58	3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	153/ 225	4.50	4.40	4.23	4.52	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	140/ 207	4.17	4.22	4.09	4.22	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	Graduate 0
					Major 0

56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENEE 610 0101  
 Title DIGITAL SIG PROC  
 Instructor: CHETTI, SAMIR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 620  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	0	2	6	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1326/1503	3.45	4.22	4.20	4.28	3.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	0	0	4	2	2.82	1253/1290	2.82	4.32	4.28	4.36	2.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	3	3	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.22	4.21	4.34	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	0	3.36	1193/1421	3.36	4.08	4.00	4.27	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.11	4.08	4.35	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	3	3	3.27	1344/1485	3.27	4.20	4.16	4.24	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1454/1504	3.91	4.68	4.69	4.79	3.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1188/1483	3.63	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	3	2	3	3.45	1318/1425	3.45	4.41	4.41	4.51	3.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	1260/1426	4.27	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	1250/1418	3.50	4.29	4.25	4.36	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1216/1416	3.60	4.34	4.26	4.38	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	4	1	1	2.70	1121/1199	2.70	3.95	3.97	4.04	2.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	997/1312	3.55	4.12	4.00	4.31	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	783/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	841/1299	4.18	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.50	4.05	4.01	4.24	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: ENEE 610 0101  
 Title DIGITAL SIG PROC  
 Instructor: CHETTI, SAMIR  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 620  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 621 0101  
 Title DET EST THEORY I  
 Instructor: MORRIS, JOEL  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 621  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.22	4.20	4.28	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	758/1290	4.29	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1276/1483	3.40	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1232/1426	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1418	4.17	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	945/1416	4.17	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	495/1199	4.25	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	465/1312	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	675/1303	4.40	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	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	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENEE 622 0101  
 Title INFORM THEORY  
 Instructor: CHANG, CHEIN-I  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 622  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1504	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	937/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1128/1485	3.83	4.20	4.16	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	731/1483	4.17	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1094/1425	4.17	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1418	4.17	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1096/1303	3.60	4.39	4.24	4.58	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1038/1299	3.80	4.34	4.25	4.56	3.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: ENEE 631 0101  
 Title SEMICOND DEVICES  
 Instructor: CHOA, FOW-SEN  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 623  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1421	4.75	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	207/ 207	2.00	4.22	4.09	4.40	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010  
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI  
 Instructor: Taylor, Richard  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 624  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	406/1504	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1503	4.77	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	407/1453	4.54	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	839/1421	3.92	4.08	4.00	4.27	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	267/1365	4.55	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	760/1504	4.85	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	306/1483	4.55	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	143/1425	4.92	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	247/1418	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1416	4.92	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	234/1312	4.69	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	157/1303	4.92	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	494/1299	4.62	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	237/ 758	4.42	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.42
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	145/ 244	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.09	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	32/ 76	4.75	4.41	4.44	4.39	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.17	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	47/ 58	3.75	3.98	4.43	4.31	3.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	47/ 56	3.75	4.12	4.23	4.26	3.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.32	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	23/ 40	4.75	4.28	4.53	4.37	4.75

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/	35	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	22/	36	4.75	4.38	4.60	4.75	4.75
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: ENEE 661 8010  
 Title SYSTEM ARCHIT AND DESI  
 Instructor: Taylor, Richard  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 624  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 662 8010  
 Title MODELING, SIM AND ANAL  
 Instructor: Marks, Maury  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 625  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1244/1504	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1272/1503	3.60	4.22	4.20	4.28	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	894/1290	4.10	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	935/1453	4.11	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.08	4.00	4.27	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1206/1485	3.70	4.20	4.16	4.24	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1287/1483	3.38	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1291/1425	3.60	4.41	4.41	4.51	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1280/1426	4.22	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1311/1418	3.22	4.29	4.25	4.36	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1232/1416	3.56	4.34	4.26	4.38	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1013/1199	3.22	3.95	3.97	4.04	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1035/1312	3.44	4.12	4.00	4.31	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	2	1	2	3.11	1189/1303	3.11	4.39	4.24	4.58	3.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1047/1299	3.78	4.34	4.25	4.56	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	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	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENEE 683 0101  
 Title LASERS  
 Instructor: CARTER, GARY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 626  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.22	4.21	4.34	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.08	4.00	4.27	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	591/1485	4.40	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1123/1483	3.75	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	905/1418	4.20	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Title

Baltimore County

JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: ADALI, TULAY

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	837/1503	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	290/1290	4.71	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	339/1485	4.62	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1173/1504	4.40	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	506/1483	4.36	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	649/1425	4.62	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	630/1418	4.46	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	593/1416	4.54	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	317/1312	4.57	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	323/1299	4.79	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	286/ 758	4.30	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: ENEE 718I 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: ADALI, TULAY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 627  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENEE 728 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN COMMUNICATIO  
 Instructor: THOMAS, JOSEPH  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 628  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.20	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.38	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENEE 785 0101  
 Title BROADBAND NETWORKS  
 Instructor: YAN, LI  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 629  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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