Course-Section: ENES 101 0101 University of Maryland INTRO ENGINEERING SCI Baltimore County

Page 652

JUN 26, 2007

Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 27

Title

84-150

0

3.00-3.49

1

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								E-20		naioa			Tna	twiator	Course	Dont	TIMDO	Torrol	Sect
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean		Level Mean	Mean
l Did wa	u gain n	General		m thia acus	200	0	0	1	2	1	6	8	4 00	1122/1522	4.02	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.0
_	_	ew insights,skil				0	0	1	1	4	6	в 6		1227/1522		3.84	4.30	4.14	3.8
		ctor make clear uestions reflect				0	0	0	2	2	6	8				3.91	4.30	4.10	4.1
	_	uestions reflect uations reflect				0	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.11	873/1285 650/1476		3.91	4.30		4.1
		eadings contribu	_			2	0	1	2	3	5	5		1065/1412		3.72	4.22		3.6
		signments contri				2	1	2	1	<i>5</i>	2	5		1170/1381		3.72	4.08	3.93	3.4
		g system clearly		_	rearmed	2	0	0	1	0	6	9		585/1500			4.18	4.16	4.4
	-	was class cance		IIIeu		2	2	0	0	0	6	8		1019/1517		4.80	4.65		4.5
	_	grade the overal		ning effect	iveness	7	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00						4.0
. 110# #0	ara you	grade the overal	rr ccuci	iiiig ciico	or veriend	,	J	_	Ü	-	3	•	1.00	050/115/	3.03	3.32	1.11	1.02	
		Lecture				_				_	_	_			4 00				
		uctor's lectures				3	0	0	0	5	5	5		1186/1440		3.78	4.45	4.40	4.(
		ctor seem intere				3	0	0	0	0	6	9		1072/1448		4.44	4.71	4.63	4.
		terial presented		_	_	2	0	1	1	4	4	6		1193/1436		3.44	4.29	4.24	3.
		es contribute to	_	•		2	1	1	2	4	1	7		1199/1432		3.31	4.29	4.23	3.
. Did au	.diovisua	l techniques enh	nance yo	our underst	anding	2	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	606/1221	3.95	3.48	3.93	3.86	4.0
Discussion																			
Did class discussions contribute to what you learne					earned	4	0	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1123/1280	3.66	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.2
Were all students actively encouraged to participate					cipate	4	0	2	3	2	1	6	3.43	1164/1277	3.06	3.56	4.34	4.13	3.
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					cussion	4	0	1	3	3	0	7	3.64	1081/1269	3.38	3.63	4.31	4.04	3.
1. Were special techniques successful						4	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	347/ 854	3.74	3.71	4.02	3.87	4.3
		Laborat	cory																
. Did th	e lab in	crease understar	nding of	f the mater	rial	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	* * *
. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequat	te backs	ground info	ormation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	* *
. Were n	ecessary	materials avail	lable fo	or lab acti	vities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	**
		structor provide				16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	**
. Were r	equireme	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early speci	fied	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	**:
		Seminar	c																
. Was th	e instru	ctor available f	for ind:	ividual att	ention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	***
. Did pr	esentati	ons contribute t	to what	you learne	ed	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	**:
_		for grading made		2		17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.79	**
		Field V																	
	_	rience contribut		_		17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	***	****	4.41	3.90	* * :
					eria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	****	4.30	3.90	**
 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria Was the instructor available for consultation 						17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	***
		Self E	Paced																
Did study questions make clear the expected goal					al	17	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.19	***
. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful						17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.57	***
;						ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits E	d Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	3				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	 0	 A	 3				 ed f	 or Ma	iore		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	5 6		V.G.	quit	eu I	OT Ma	. 101 8	5	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma J	<i>)</i>	U
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	18
04 150	_	2.00 2.55	1	5	0		00.	u	_				-	J 9	_ ~~	-	24011		

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P I ?	0 0 3	Other	12	responses to be significant

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 27

Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 653

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	0	0	1	5	5	7	9	3.67	1338/1522	4.02	4.01	4.30	4.14	3.67
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	3	8	6	8		1306/1522		3.84	4.26	4.18	3.65
		estions reflec			0	0	2	1	5	9	10		1034/1285		3.91	4.30	4.22	3.89
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	1	2	2	13	7		1103/1476		3.81	4.22	4.09	3.92
				what you learned	2	1	3	0	6	9	6		1100/1412		3.72	4.06	4.01	3.63
				what you learned	1	3	4	0	7	6	6		1184/1381	3.66	3.71	4.08	3.93	3.43
		g system clearl			1	0	0	3	3	8	12		924/1500		4.12	4.18	4.16	4.12
		was class canc			1	1	0	0	0	4			623/1517		4.80	4.65	4.62	4.84
				ning effectiveness	1	2	0	3	9	10			1301/1497		3.52			3.46
J. 110W WOO	ara you s	grade ene overa	II ccaci	ing criccerveness	_	-	Ü	3		10	_	3.10	1301/113/	3.03	3.32		1.02	3.10
		Lectur																
		actor's lecture			1	0	0	5	2	9	10	3.92	1238/1440	4.09	3.78	4.45	4.40	3.92
		ctor seem inter		1	0	0	1	3	3	19	4.54	1131/1448	4.55	4.44	4.71	4.63	4.54	
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	xplained clearly	1	0	2	4	7	10	3	3.31	1343/1436	3.86	3.44	4.29	4.24	3.31	
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	you learned	1	1	1	4	6	7	7	3.60	1243/1432	3.89	3.31	4.29	4.23	3.60	
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	our understanding	1	0	0	3	6	8	9	3.88	707/1221	3.95	3.48	3.93	3.86	3.88	
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al-	aa diaa			what you learned	4	0	4	2	7	_	_	2 22	1146/1280	3.66	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.22
				d to participate	5	0	8	4	5	2	3		1269/1277	3.06	3.56	4.34	4.13	2.45
		-	_	d open discussion	5	0	3	6	7	2	4		1231/1269		3.63	4.31		2.45
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	5	12	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	735/ 854		3.71	4.02		3.30
4. Were St	pecial te	ecinitques succe	SSLUI		5	12	۷	1	Т	4	4	3.30	/35/ 654	3.74	3.71	4.02	3.07	3.30
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding of	f the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	structor provid	e assis	ance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
				Frequ	enas	, Diet	-rih	ut i ou	2									
				riequ	terrey	DISC		uc101	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 9	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	 guire	ed f	or M	 aior	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 14						,	-	-	CLAGAGE	-	-		_	ŭ
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C 3		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad 2	:7	Non-	major	27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001	u.	-				_	onder 9			1,011		۷,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 1		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
0100.	ŭ	3.33 1.00	•	P 0				. 25				_	respons				_	
				I O		O+1	ner				2	2	TCCCOID		5191			
				? 1		0.01					_	_						
				. ±														

INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Title Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 18

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 3

3

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 654 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did way an	Genera in new insights, ski	_	m +bia aou		1	0	0	1	1	_	10	4.41	720/1522	4.02	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.41
	structor make clear				1	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.41	763/1522		3.84	4.26	4.14	4.41
	am questions reflec				1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	328/1285		3.91	4.30		4.71
	evaluations reflect				1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	682/1476		3.81	4.22		4.35
	ed readings contrib				1	1	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	722/1412		3.72	4.06	4.01	4.06
	n assignments contr				1	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	779/1381	3.66	3.71	4.08	3.93	4.06
	ading system clearly				1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	463/1500	4.34	4.12	4.18	4.16	4.53
8. How many t	imes was class cance	elled			1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	668/1517	4.77	4.80	4.65	4.62	4.82
9. How would	you grade the overa	ll teach	hing effect	tiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	852/1497	3.85	3.52	4.11	4.02	4.08
	T a = b	_																
1 Were the i	Lecture nstructor's lecture		orenared		1	0	1	0	3	5	R	4 12	1142/1440	4.09	3.78	4.45	4.40	4.12
	structor seem inter			ect	1	0	1	0	0	4	12		1140/1448		4.44	4.71		4.53
	e material presente		-		1	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	- ,		3.44	4.29		4.24
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	7	7	4.31			3.31	4.29		4.31
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						0	2	3	4	5	3.86				3.93	3.86	
1 544 -1	Discus				4	_	_	1	2	4	_	4 07	604/1000	2.66	2 64	4 10	2 00	4 07
	discussions contrib				4	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	,	3.66	3.64		3.92	4.07
	tudents actively enstructor encourage:				4	0	2 1	3	4 4	4	3		1180/1277 1167/1269	3.06 3.38	3.56	4.34	4.13	3.36 3.29
	al techniques succes		a open disc	CUSSION	4	7	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	426/ 854			4.02		
i. Were speci	ar ceemingues succes	BBLUI			-	,	_	U	_	_	-	1.00	120/ 051	3.71	3.71	1.02	3.07	1.00
	Labora																	
	b increase understa	_			15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
	rovided with adequa	-	-		15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
	sary materials avail			ivities	15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
	b instructor provide				15 15	0 1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requi	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	***
	Fr							ution	n									
Credits Earne	d Cum CDA	d Cradea				Por	ason	a			Туј	20			Majors			
credits raille	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra									o 								
00-27 2							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 2	-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 8																	
56-83 2	2.00-2.99	2	C		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	18	

Electives

Other

0

15

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

1

0

0

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 655 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean	Sect	evel	UMBC	Dept	Course	tructor	Inst		3	ncies	equei	Fr			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 8 3 4.00 1122/1522 4.02 4.01 4.30 4.14 4. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 4 5 4.00 1080/1522 3.96 3.84 4.26 4.18 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 849/1285 4.21 3.91 4.30 4.22 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 4 3.93 1103/1476 4.15 3.81 4.22 4.09 3. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 3 5 3.79 989/1412 3.79 3.72 4.06 4.01 3. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 3 7 1 3.67 1097/1381 3.66 3.71 4.08 3.93 3. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	Mean			_		Rank	Mean	5			_		NA	NR	Questions
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 8 3 4.00 1122/1522 4.02 4.01 4.30 4.14 4. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 4 5 4.00 1080/1522 3.96 3.84 4.26 4.18 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 849/1285 4.21 3.91 4.30 4.22 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 4 3.93 1103/1476 4.15 3.81 4.22 4.09 3. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 3 5 3.79 989/1412 3.79 3.72 4.06 4.01 3. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 3 7 1 3.67 1097/1381 3.66 3.71 4.08 3.93 3. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 4 5 4.00 1080/1522 3.96 3.84 4.26 4.18 4. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 849/1285 4.21 3.91 4.30 4.22 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 4 3.93 1103/1476 4.15 3.81 4.22 4.09 3. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 3 5 3.79 989/1412 3.79 3.72 4.06 4.01 3. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 3 7 1 3.67 1097/1381 3.66 3.71 4.08 3.93 3. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 600/1517 4.77 4.80 4.65 4.62 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.								_	_		_	_	_		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 3 7 4.14 849/1285 4.21 3.91 4.30 4.22 4. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 4 3.93 1103/1476 4.15 3.81 4.22 4.09 3. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 3 5 3.79 989/1412 3.79 3.72 4.06 4.01 3.66 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 3 7 1 3.67 1097/1381 3.66 3.71 4.08 3.93 3. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 600/1517 4.77 4.80 4.65 4.62 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	4.00					, -					-	-			
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 5 5 4 3.93 1103/1476 4.15 3.81 4.22 4.09 3. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 4 3 5 3.79 989/1412 3.79 3.72 4.06 4.01 3.66 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 3 7 1 3.67 1097/1381 3.66 3.71 4.08 3.93 3.70 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 600/1517 4.77 4.80 4.65 4.62 4.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	4.00														
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 3 5 3.79 989/1412 3.79 3.72 4.06 4.01 3.66 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 3 7 1 3.67 1097/1381 3.66 3.71 4.08 3.93 3.73 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 600/1517 4.77 4.80 4.65 4.62 4.9 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4.2 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4.3 Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	4.14							-		-					-
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 1 3 7 1 3.67 1097/1381 3.66 3.71 4.08 3.93 3. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 600/1517 4.77 4.80 4.65 4.62 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	3.93									-		-			
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 4 7 4.29 750/1500 4.34 4.12 4.18 4.16 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 600/1517 4.77 4.80 4.65 4.62 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	3.79							-							
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 600/1517 4.77 4.80 4.65 4.62 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.								_				-			
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 6 3 3.85 1081/1497 3.85 3.52 4.11 4.02 3. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.						,									
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Contact the set of the subject of the sub									_		-	-	-		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	3.85	4.02	4.11	3.52	3.85	1081/1497	3.85	3	6	3	1	U	0	1	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 7 5 4.31 1007/1440 4.09 3.78 4.45 4.40 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.															Lecture
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 1131/1448 4.55 4.44 4.71 4.63 4. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	4.31	4.40	4.45	3.78	4.09	1007/1440	4.31	5	7	1	0	0	0	1	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1013/1436 3.86 3.44 4.29 4.24 4.	4.54	4.63	4.71	4.44				8	4	1	0	0	0	1	
	4.08	4.24	4.29		3.86			5	4	2	1	0	0	2	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 3 5 4 3.92 1108/1432 3.89 3.31 4.29 4.23 3.	3.92	4.23	4.29	3.31	3.89	1108/1432	3.92	4	5	3	1	0	0	1	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1 2 5 5 4.08 582/1221 3.95 3.48 3.93 3.86 4.	4.08	3.86	3.93	3.48	3.95	582/1221	4.08	5	5	2	1	0	0	1	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding
Discussion								_	_			_	_	_	
	4.08							-	-	_		-	-		-
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3.00					,		_	-	-			-		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 2 4 3 4 3.69 1062/1269 3.38 3.63 4.31 4.04 3.								_							
4. Were special techniques successful 1 4 0 1 4 3 1 3.44 692/854 3.74 3.71 4.02 3.87 3.	3.44	3.87	4.02	3.71	3.74	692/ 854	3.44	1	3	4	1	0	4	1	4. Were special techniques successful
Laboratory															Laboratory
•	***	4.31	4.36	****	****	****/ 215	3.50	0	1	1	0	0	0	12	-
· ·	***	4.33	4.35	****	****	****/ 228	3.00	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	
	***	4.51	4.51	****	****			0	1	1	0	0	0		
•	***	4.41	4.42	****	****	****/ 216	4.00	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	-
	****	4.28	4.23	****	****	****/ 205	4.00	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	
Seminar									_	_	_	_	_		
3. Did lesearch projects contribute to what you rearned 15 0 0 0 1 3.00 / 05 4.49 3.05	* * * *			****	****	, 05		_	-		-	-			
1. Did presentations contribute to what you rearried 15 0 0 0 1 0 0 5.00 / 70 1.15 5.00	****			****	****	, -									-
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 4.11 3.79 **	****	3.79	4.11	****	****	****/ 80	5.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5. Were criteria for grading made clear
Field Work															Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	***	3.90	4.41	****	****	****/ 47	5.00	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned
	***	3.90	4.30	****	****	****/ 45	4.00	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	
	***	3.99	4.40	****	****	****/ 39	3.00	0	0	1	0	0	0	13	
	***	4.00	4.31	****	****	****/ 35	2.00	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	
Self Paced	***	4 52	4 63	اد ماد ماد ماد		****/ OF	2 00	0	0	1	0	_	0	1.2	
1. Did sell-paced system conclidate to what you learned 15 0 0 1 0 0 5.00 / 5/ 4.05 4.55	****					,		-	-				-		
,	****					, -		_	-						
	****					, 55									-
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 15 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 """ 18 """ 4.49 4.11 ""		4.11	4.49			/ 18	1.00	U	U	U	U	Т	U	13	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 655 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 110 0101 University of Maryland Title STATICS Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 656

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1. Did	d vou as	in ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	899/1522	4.34	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.25
			tor make clear			1	0	0	1	3	8	4		1157/1522	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.18	3.94
			estions reflec			1	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	938/1285		3.91	4.30	4.22	4.00
		_	ations reflect		_	1	1	1	0	4	7	3		1207/1476		3.81	4.22	4.09	3.73
					what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	852/1412	4.02	3.72	4.06	4.01	3.94
	_		_		o what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	1188/1381	3.78	3.71	4.08	3.93	3.43
7. Was	s the gr	ading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	956/1500	4.09	4.12	4.18	4.16	4.06
8. How	w many t	imes	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.82	4.80	4.65	4.62	4.88
9. How	w would	you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	1	3	3	5	2	3.29	1361/1497	3.50	3.52	4.11	4.02	3.29
			Lectur	e															
1. Wer	re the i	nstru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	1	1	0	6	8	4.19	1100/1440	4.01	3.78	4.45	4.40	4.19
2. Did	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	1	1	1	7	6	4.00	1353/1448	4.33	4.44	4.71	4.63	4.00
3. Was	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	2	2	4	5	3	3.31	1340/1436	3.46	3.44	4.29	4.24	3.31
4. Did	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	3	0	7	3	3	3.19	1346/1432	3.39	3.31	4.29	4.23	3.19
5. Did	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	1	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	720/1221	3.58	3.48	3.93	3.86	3.87
			Discus	sion															
					what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	424/1280	4.13	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.46
			_	_	d to participate	4	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	766/1277	3.99	3.56	4.34	4.13	4.31
			_		d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	857/1269	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.04	4.08
4. Wer	re speci	al te	chniques succe	ssful		4	5	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	194/ 854	3.53	3.71	4.02	3.87	4.50
			Labora																
			rease understa	_		16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
					ground information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 228	****	****	4.35	4.33	****
					or lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
			tructor provid			16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.41	****
5. Wer	re requi	remen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.28	****
					Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
Credit	ts Earne	d	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 7 6		0 00-0 99	 1	 Δ 5					 or Ms	ior		0	Graduat		0	Maic		0
				0			100	1411	.a _ (,		~	•	Gradat	_	~	11000	-	J
				-			Ger	neral					0	Under-a	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	17
							001		=				-	5114C1 9	1		2.011		
Grad.			3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	h
	·			-	P 0													_	
					I O		Ot.1	ner				1	4					-	
					? 0							_							
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-15	7 6 5 5 3 0		0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	1 0 3 4	A 5 B 6 C 4 D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0		Gei Ele		ed fo				0	Graduat Under-g #### - 1	e rad 1 Means t		Majo Non- are not	or -majo:	 r

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENES 110 0102 Page 657 Title STATICS JUN 26, 2007 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	1122/1522	4.34	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1253/1522	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.18	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1106/1285	3.94	3.91	4.30	4.22	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	4	1	2	2	3.22	1386/1476	3.72	3.81	4.22	4.09	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	655/1412	4.02	3.72	4.06	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	1	2	4	3.33	1227/1381	3.78	3.71	4.08	3.93	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1161/1500	4.09	4.12	4.18	4.16	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	983/1517	4.82	4.80	4.65	4.62	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	2	4	0	2.73	1462/1497	3.50	3.52	4.11	4.02	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	4	4	3.69	1324/1440	4.01	3.78	4.45	4.40	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	2	5	3	3.62	1416/1448	4.33	4.44	4.71	4.63	3.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1365/1436	3.46	3.44	4.29	4.24	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	4	1	2	2.69	1391/1432	3.39	3.31	4.29	4.23	2.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	4	1	3	2	2	2.75	1133/1221	3.58	3.48	3.93	3.86	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	1031/1280	4.13	3.64	4.10	3.92	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1050/1277	3.99	3.56	4.34	4.13	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1144/1269	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.04	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	832/ 854	3.53	3.71	4.02	3.87	2.50
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-		-	
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 110 0201 Title

STATICS

IRVINE, DAVID E Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 658 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	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	0	1	2	9	4.67	433/1522	4.34	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	787/1522	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1018/1285	3.94	3.91	4.30	4.22	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	860/1476	3.72	3.81	4.22	4.09	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	339/1412	4.02	3.72	4.06	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1381	3.78	3.71	4.08	3.93	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	780/1500	4.09	4.12	4.18	4.16	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	487/1517	4.82	4.80	4.65	4.62	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	898/1497	3.50	3.52	4.11	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1112/1440	4.01	3.78	4.45	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	444/1448	4.33	4.44	4.71	4.63	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1147/1436	3.46	3.44	4.29	4.24	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1117/1432	3.39	3.31	4.29	4.23	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	461/1221	3.58	3.48	3.93	3.86	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	631/1280	4.13	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1153/1277	3.99	3.56	4.34	4.13	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	7	1	2	3.36	1151/1269	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.04	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	737/ 854	3.53	3.71	4.02	3.87	3.29
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.53	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.31	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENES 110 0202 University of Maryland Title STATICS Baltimore County Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

26

University of Maryland Page 659
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

		0				373		-	ncies	5	-		tructor		Dept			Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	681/1522	4.34	4.01	4.30	4.14	4.44
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	3	6	8		1016/1522	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.18	4.11
		estions reflec			1	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	873/1285	3.94	3.91	4.30	4.22	4.12
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1217/1476	3.72	3.81	4.22	4.09	3.71
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	7	2	3.47	1183/1412	4.02	3.72	4.06	4.01	3.47
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	5	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	1124/1381	3.78	3.71	4.08	3.93	3.62
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	760/1500	4.09	4.12	4.18	4.16	4.28
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	532/1517	4.82	4.80	4.65	4.62	4.89
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	898/1497	3.50	3.52	4.11	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture			0	0	1	1	2	7	7		1186/1440		3.78	4.45	4.40	4.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	2	15		821/1448	4.33	4.44	4.71	4.63	4.78
		-		xplained clearly	0	0	1	1	8	5	3		1301/1436		3.44	4.29	4.24	3.44
		es contribute t		-	0	0	1	1	4	7	5		1182/1432		3.31	4.29	4.23	3.78
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	2	1	4	7	3	3.47	916/1221	3.58	3.48	3.93	3.86	3.47
1 1 - 1		Discus			•	0	•	-	•			4 20	400/1000	4 10	2 64	4 10	2 00	4 20
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	. ,	4.13	3.64	4.10	3.92	4.39
				d to participate	1	0	0 1	1	2			4.41	,	3.99	3.56	4.34	4.13	4.41
		_		d open discussion	2 1	υ 5	U T	2	3 4	3	-		1066/1269	3.63	3.63	4.31	4.04	3.69
4. were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiui		Τ	5	U	Τ	4	3	4	3.83	555/ 854	3.53	3.71	4.02	3.87	3.83
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 28-55	6 3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 1	A 4 B 8		Ked	quire	ea I	or Ma	ajor	S	U	Graduat	=	0	Majo	r.	0
28-55 56-83	3 1	2.00-2.99	0			Cos	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Mon	major	18
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	3	C 4 D 0		Gei	iera.	L				U	under-g.	Lau I	.0	NOII-	iiia JOE	10
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	3 4	F 0		רים.	ectiv	70.0				0	#### - 1	Moona +	horo a	ro not	onous	h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		Elt	=CCT'	ves				U	respons				_	11
				т 0		O+1	ner				1	7	T CPFOIIR	a LU L	e sigi	ııııdlı	. C	
				Ι υ		OEI	ier.				Т	. /						

0

Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS

Instructor: ROSENFELD, MICH

Enrollment: 17

Spring 2007

Page 660 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	12	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	787/1522	4.33	3.84	4.26	4.29	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	638/1285	4.42	3.91	4.30	4.36	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	703/1476	4.33	3.81	4.22	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1308/1412	3.17	3.72	4.06	4.00	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	693/1381	4.17	3.71	4.08	3.97	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.12	4.18	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.80	4.65	4.63	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.52	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1112/1440	4.17	3.78	4.45	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	444/1448	4.92	4.44	4.71	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	502/1436	4.58	3.44	4.29	4.29	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	3.31	4.29	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	803/1221	3.73	3.48	3.93	4.02	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	499/1280	4.38	3.64	4.10	4.08	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	375/1277	4.75	3.56	4.34	4.33	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	586/1269	4.50	3.63	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	314/ 854	4.29	3.71	4.02	4.00	4.29
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****
•									,					

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	8	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENES 221 0101 University of Maryland Title DYNAMICS Baltimore County Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

30

niversity of Maryland Page 661
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	que	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	3	5	9	5	3.73	1310/1522	3.45	4.01	4.30	4.34	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	8	8	3	3	3.05	1477/1522	3.25	3.84	4.26	4.29	3.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	5	7	3	3.23	1231/1285	3.31	3.91	4.30	4.36	3.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1245/1476	3.30	3.81	4.22	4.20	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1207/1412	3.41	3.72	4.06	4.00	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1028/1381	3.55	3.71	4.08	3.97	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	5	8	6		1147/1500	3.79	4.12	4.18	4.20	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20		487/1517	4.96	4.80	4.65	4.63	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	5	11	0	1	2.72	1462/1497	2.96	3.52	4.11	4.11	2.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	Ω	3	5	10	2	Λ	2 55	1427/1440	2.93	3.78	4.45	4.42	2.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	3	2	7	8		1353/1448	4.27	4.44	4.71	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	7	6	5	1	0		1429/1436	2.47	3.44	4.29	4.29	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	9	3	5	1	1		1417/1432	2.19	3.31	4.29	4.31	2.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	5	7	3	3	1		1185/1221		3.48	3.93	4.02	2.37
5. Did dddiovibadi ceelmiqueb elmanee jour anderseanding	3	-	3	,	3	3	_	2.57	1103/1221	2.03	3.10	3.75	1.02	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	2	2	4	1	2.47	1259/1280	2.71	3.64	4.10	4.08	2.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1150/1277	3.25	3.56	4.34	4.33	3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	2	3	2	7	3.80	1002/1269	3.66	3.63	4.31	4.33	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	14	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	****	3.71	4.02	4.00	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	С	9	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENES 221 0102 University of Maryland DYNAMICS IRVINE, DAVID E Instructor:

Ρ

I 0

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 662

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

23

Enrollment:	29		
Questionnaires:	25	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 3 3 5 9 5 3.40 1441/1522 3.45 4.01 4.30 4.34 3.40 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 9 6 5 3.40 1404/1522 3.25 3.84 4.26 4.29 3.40 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 5 6 7 6 3.48 1168/1285 3.31 3.91 4.30 4.36 3.48 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 4 4 2 2 3.17 1398/1476 3.30 3.81 4.22 4.20 3.17 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 1 2 4 5 4 3.56 1133/1412 3.41 3.72 4.06 4.00 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 2 4 96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.02 2.78
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 3 3 5 9 5 3.40 1441/1522 3.45 4.01 4.30 4.34 3.40 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 9 6 5 3.40 1404/1522 3.25 3.84 4.26 4.29 3.40 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 5 6 7 6 3.48 1168/1285 3.31 3.91 4.30 4.36 3.48 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 4 4 2 2 3.17 1398/1476 3.30 3.81 4.22 4.20 3.17 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 1 2 4 5 4 3.56 1133/1412 3.41 3.72 4.06 4.00 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 2 4 96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.02 2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 9 6 5 3.40 1404/1522 3.25 3.84 4.26 4.29 3.40 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 5 6 7 6 3.48 1168/1285 3.31 3.91 4.30 4.36 3.48 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 4 4 2 2 3.17 1398/1476 3.30 3.81 4.22 4.20 3.17 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 1 2 4 5 4 3.56 1133/1412 3.41 3.72 4.06 4.00 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 2 4 96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 7. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 5 6 7 6 3.48 1168/1285 3.31 3.91 4.30 4.36 3.48 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 4 4 2 2 3.17 1398/1476 3.30 3.81 4.22 4.20 3.17 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 1 2 4 5 4 3.56 1133/1412 3.41 3.72 4.06 4.00 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 2 4.96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 2.00 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 13 0 4 4 2 2 3.17 1398/1476 3.30 3.81 4.22 4.20 3.17 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 1 2 4 5 4 3.56 1133/1412 3.41 3.72 4.06 4.00 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 2 0 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 22 4.96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 7. The state of the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 7. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 7. Did the lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 7. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 7. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 1 2 4 5 4 3.56 1133/1412 3.41 3.72 4.06 4.00 3.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 22 4.96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 1 3 2 2 3 3.27 1244/1381 3.55 3.71 4.08 3.97 3.27 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 22 4.96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 2 6 6 10 3.88 1099/1500 3.79 4.12 4.18 4.20 3.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 22 4.96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 2 0 0 0 1 22 4.96 244/1517 4.96 4.80 4.65 4.63 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 3 5 7 5 3 3.00 1418/1497 2.96 3.52 4.11 4.11 3.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. The state of the instructor is a subject in the subjec
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 4 5 8 3 3.00 1404/1440 2.93 3.78 4.45 4.42 3.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 1 5 18 4.60 1072/1448 4.27 4.44 4.71 4.78 4.60 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 4 9 5 1 2.64 1413/1436 2.47 3.44 4.29 4.29 2.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 12 4 5 3 0 1.96 1420/1432 2.19 3.31 4.29 4.31 1.96 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 5 5 5 6 2 2.78 1125/1221 2.63 3.48 3.93 4.02 2.78
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 5 3 3 6 3 2.95 1206/1280 2.71 3.64 4.10 4.08 2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 4 1 3 5 7 3.50 1136/1277 3.25 3.56 4.34 4.33 3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1 1 1 9 8 4.10 853/1269 3.66 3.63 4.31 4.33 4.10
4. Were special techniques successful 6 17 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 854 **** 3.71 4.02 4.00 ****
Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 24 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.41 4.83 ****
Frequency Distribution
Ilequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6
56-83 11 2.00-2.99 5 C 11 General 0 Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 5 D 0
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENES 221 0103

DYNAMICS

31

IRVINE, DAVID E

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

Page 663 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	1	0	3	4	7	8	4	3.23	1467/1522	3.45	4.01	4.30	4.34	3.23
		tor make clear			1	0	2	5	6	9	4	3.31	1426/1522	3.25	3.84	4.26	4.29	3.31
		estions reflect	_	_	1	0	2	5	7	9	3	3.23	1229/1285		3.91	4.30	4.36	3.23
	_	ations reflect		-	1	13	1	3	5	2	2	3.08	1411/1476	3.30	3.81	4.22	4.20	3.08
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ıte to w	hat you learned	1	5	2	1	9	8	1	3.24	1293/1412	3.41	3.72	4.06	4.00	3.24
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	. 1	14	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1134/1381	3.55	3.71	4.08	3.97	3.58
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	v explai	ned	1	1	1	4	5	7	8	3.68	1227/1500	3.79	4.12	4.18	4.20	3.68
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	3	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1517	4.96	4.80	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	7	0	4	1	5	8	2	3.15	1398/1497	2.96	3.52	4.11	4.11	3.15
		Lecture																
		ctor's lecture:			2	0	3	5	5	7	5		1395/1440		3.78	4.45	4.42	3.24
		tor seem inter		_	2	0	2	2	2	2			1319/1448		4.44	4.71	4.78	4.20
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	5	6	5	8			1405/1436		3.44	4.29	4.29	2.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	2	6	6	6	2			1398/1432		3.31			2.57	
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	6	1	5	6	2	3	4	2.75	1133/1221	2.63	3.48	3.93	4.02	2.75
		Discus						_	_	_	_							
				hat you learned	13	0	4	Τ	6	Ţ	2		1244/1280		3.64		4.08	2.71
				to participate	14	0	5	0	2	5	1		1253/1277	3.25	3.56	4.34	4.33	2.77
				open discussion	14	0	4	0	4	1	4		1205/1269	3.66	3.63	4.31	4.33	3.08
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssiul		14	11	1	0	1	0	U	2.00	****/ 854	****	3.71	4.02	4.00	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C 7		Ge:	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	16	Non-	-major	27
84-150																		
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 6 F 0						El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 1		Ot:	her				2	2						
? 3																		