

Course Section: ENES 101 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 698  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	769/1669	4.21	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	9	9	4.00	1094/1666	3.79	4.25	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	5	4	13	4.22	847/1421	3.87	4.26	4.24	4.11	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	750/1617	4.18	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	1	4	6	9	3.74	1079/1555	3.49	3.78	4.00	3.92	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	5	7	7	4.00	895/1543	3.83	4.17	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	6	4	10	3.91	1149/1647	4.12	4.24	4.12	4.06	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	357/1668	4.95	4.86	4.67	4.62	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	1005/1605	3.78	4.15	4.07	3.96	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	1	7	11	4.09	1174/1514	3.95	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	1160/1551	4.51	4.71	4.66	4.55	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	7	9	3.91	1157/1503	3.62	4.10	4.24	4.17	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	6	4	11	4.14	1002/1506	3.89	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	6	2	9	4.00	587/1311	3.61	3.69	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	771/1490	3.93	4.12	4.05	3.85	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	2	0	3	12	3.81	1179/1502	3.48	3.68	4.26	4.06	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	0	2	5	10	3.81	1168/1489	3.50	3.88	4.29	4.07	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	10	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	271/1006	3.95	3.85	4.00	3.81	4.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENES 101 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 698  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	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	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENES 101 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 699  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	1145/1669	4.21	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	3	7	3.57	1442/1666	3.79	4.25	4.19	4.11	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	5	5	3.52	1215/1421	3.87	4.26	4.24	4.11	3.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	9	4.05	1005/1617	4.18	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	5	4	5	3.25	1359/1555	3.49	3.78	4.00	3.92	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	1195/1543	3.83	4.17	4.06	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	759/1647	4.12	4.24	4.12	4.06	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.86	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	4	7	2	3.60	1312/1605	3.78	4.15	4.07	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	1307/1514	3.95	4.43	4.39	4.32	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	1216/1551	4.51	4.71	4.66	4.55	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	4	4	6	3.33	1380/1503	3.62	4.10	4.24	4.17	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	2	9	3.65	1281/1506	3.89	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	2	6	4	4	3.21	1069/1311	3.61	3.69	3.85	3.68	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	7	4	7	3.70	1069/1490	3.93	4.12	4.05	3.85	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	5	2	4	3	6	3.15	1384/1502	3.48	3.68	4.26	4.06	3.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	4	4	4	5	3.20	1371/1489	3.50	3.88	4.29	4.07	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	11	1	2	2	0	4	3.44	789/1006	3.95	3.85	4.00	3.81	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENES 101 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 699  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENES 101H 0101  
 Title: INTR0 ENGR SCI -HONORS  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 700  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	633/1669	4.47	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	827/1666	4.29	4.25	4.19	4.11	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	484/1421	4.59	4.26	4.24	4.11	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	821/1617	4.24	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.78	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	659/1543	4.25	4.17	4.06	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	204/1647	4.76	4.24	4.12	4.06	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.86	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	713/1605	4.23	4.15	4.07	3.96	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	727/1514	4.56	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.71	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	941/1503	4.19	4.10	4.24	4.17	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	901/1506	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	552/1311	4.07	3.69	3.85	3.68	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	2	7	3.75	1036/1490	3.75	4.12	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	1	4	2	6	3.44	1326/1502	3.44	3.68	4.26	4.06	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	1163/1489	3.81	3.88	4.29	4.07	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	607/1006	3.91	3.85	4.00	3.81	3.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 1	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 17
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 12

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

Course Section: ENES 101Y 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 701  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	5	5	5	9	3.64	1418/1669	3.93	4.46	4.23	4.02	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	11	4	4	3.20	1548/1666	3.69	4.25	4.19	4.11	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	11	6	3.80	1118/1421	4.04	4.26	4.24	4.11	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	8	13	1	3.46	1398/1617	3.75	4.32	4.15	3.99	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	1	7	4	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.54	3.78	4.00	3.92	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	5	5	6	3.32	1328/1543	3.60	4.17	4.06	3.86	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	7	8	3.80	1250/1647	4.13	4.24	4.12	4.06	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	23	4.80	901/1668	4.90	4.86	4.67	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	7	6	3	3.65	1286/1605	3.74	4.15	4.07	3.96	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	9	10	4.13	1160/1514	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	11	13	4.54	1160/1551	4.59	4.71	4.66	4.55	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	8	9	4	3.54	1318/1503	3.54	4.10	4.24	4.17	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	11	4	3.50	1319/1506	3.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	2	3	9	2	3.15	1088/1311	3.28	3.69	3.85	3.68	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	4	6	6	3.36	1225/1490	3.64	4.12	4.05	3.85	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	2	10	4	1	2.73	1456/1502	2.86	3.68	4.26	4.06	2.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	10	4	3	3.00	1398/1489	3.10	3.88	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	1	8	4	0	3.23	880/1006	3.27	3.85	4.00	3.81	3.23	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	4	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	15				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENES 101Y 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 702  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	11	9	4.23	951/1669	3.93	4.46	4.23	4.02	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	966/1666	3.69	4.25	4.19	4.11	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	797/1421	4.04	4.26	4.24	4.11	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	11	5	4.05	999/1617	3.75	4.32	4.15	3.99	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	1087/1555	3.54	3.78	4.00	3.92	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	5	4	7	3.89	1035/1543	3.60	4.17	4.06	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	9	12	4.45	566/1647	4.13	4.24	4.12	4.06	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	4.90	4.86	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	10	2	3.82	1156/1605	3.74	4.15	4.07	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	1042/1514	4.22	4.43	4.39	4.32	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	1069/1551	4.59	4.71	4.66	4.55	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	4	11	3	3.55	1318/1503	3.54	4.10	4.24	4.17	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	1121/1506	3.73	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	5	8	3	3.40	995/1311	3.28	3.69	3.85	3.68	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	9	7	3.91	956/1490	3.64	4.12	4.05	3.85	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	5	1	7	7	2	3.00	1395/1502	2.86	3.68	4.26	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	0	7	8	2	3.19	1373/1489	3.10	3.88	4.29	4.07	3.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	1	0	6	1	2	3.30	855/1006	3.27	3.85	4.00	3.81	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	5.00	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENES 200 0101  
 Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS  
 Instructor: CARTON, SEAN M  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 703  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.89	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.78	4.25	4.19	4.29	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	4.26	4.24	4.35	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	195/1617	4.78	4.32	4.15	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1407/1555	3.13	3.78	4.00	3.96	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	690/1543	4.22	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	194/1647	4.78	4.24	4.12	4.19	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1400/1668	4.22	4.86	4.67	4.59	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.15	4.07	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.43	4.39	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.71	4.66	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.10	4.24	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	264/1311	4.50	3.69	3.85	3.96	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	389/1490	4.60	4.12	4.05	4.11	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	3.68	4.26	4.31	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.88	4.29	4.36	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	3.85	4.00	3.99	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	5.00	4.20	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course Section: ENES 220 0101  
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS  
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 704  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	16	44	4.59	489/1669	4.59	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	25	31	4.31	801/1666	4.31	4.25	4.19	4.29	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	14	18	29	4.14	901/1421	4.14	4.26	4.24	4.35	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	27	0	0	8	10	17	4.26	801/1617	4.26	4.32	4.15	4.24	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	4	8	11	16	20	3.68	1126/1555	3.68	3.78	4.00	3.96	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	0	0	4	14	16	4.35	562/1543	4.35	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	7	25	29	4.27	851/1647	4.27	4.24	4.12	4.19	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	62	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.86	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	1	4	15	29	4.47	423/1605	4.47	4.15	4.07	4.15	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	24	36	4.55	751/1514	4.55	4.43	4.39	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	9	53	4.85	650/1551	4.85	4.71	4.66	4.72	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	8	23	26	4.16	959/1503	4.16	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	5	15	38	4.44	718/1506	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	28	3	6	2	14	8	3.55	919/1311	3.55	3.69	3.85	3.96	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	56	0	2	3	1	3	0	2.56	****/1490	****	4.12	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	56	0	2	2	2	1	2	2.89	****/1502	****	3.68	4.26	4.31	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	56	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	****/1489	****	3.88	4.29	4.36	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	5.00	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 21	Required for Majors 0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B 31	
56-83	17	2.00-2.99	11	C 6	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	15	D 1	Under-grad 65
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F 0	Non-major 65
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Electives 1
					Other 56

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

Course Section: ENES 220H 0101  
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS  
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 705  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1669	4.94	4.46	4.23	4.34	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	126/1666	4.94	4.25	4.19	4.29	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1078/1421	4.44	4.26	4.24	4.35	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.86	4.32	4.15	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	611/1555	4.60	3.78	4.00	3.96	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1543	4.93	4.17	4.06	4.10	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1187/1647	3.94	4.24	4.12	4.19	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.94	4.86	4.67	4.59	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	789/1605	4.58	4.15	4.07	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	799/1514	4.75	4.43	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1083/1551	4.81	4.71	4.66	4.72	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1503	4.63	4.10	4.24	4.29	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	353/1506	4.88	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	846/1311	3.67	3.69	3.85	3.96	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1490	4.75	4.12	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.25	3.68	4.26	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	3.88	4.29	4.36	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.85	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	5.00	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENES 220H 0102  
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS  
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 706  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	4.94	4.46	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	4.94	4.25	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.44	4.26	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	4.86	4.32	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	4.60	3.78	4.00	3.96	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.93	4.17	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1043/1647	3.94	4.24	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.86	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.58	4.15	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1514	4.75	4.43	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.81	4.71	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.63	4.10	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.30	4.26	4.33	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.75	4.12	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.25	3.68	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	3.88	4.29	4.36	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

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