Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 02	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	31
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci			Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	962/1528	4.04	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	704/1527	4.08	4.14	4.28	4.23	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	648/1333	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.26	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	592/1495	4.10	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	824/1439	3.80	3.89	4.11	3.97	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	806/1425	3.87	3.82	4.12	3.93	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	808/1508	4.14	4.21	4.18	4.11	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1122/1526	4.21	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	555/1490	3.98	4.04	4.11	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	794/1428	4.46	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	964/1436	4.68	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	669/1427	4.07	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	667/1425	3.98	4.10	4.34	4.31	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	553/1291	3.75	3.91	4.05	3.97	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	365/1271	4.28	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	750/1276	4.16	4.18	4.33	4.14	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	1	8	3.93	995/1273	4.05	4.21	4.38	4.18	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	467/922	3.80	3.86	4.02	3.87	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 02		Term - Fall 2010				Enrollment:	31
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci						Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M							

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 03
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	7	8	3.83	1270/1528	4.04	4.19	4.31	4.16	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	6	9	3.96	1169/1527	4.08	4.14	4.28	4.23	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	7	8	3.87	1110/1333	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.26	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	4	6	4	6	3.36	1403/1495	4.10	4.20	4.25	4.11	3.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	8	7	1	2.91	1394/1439	3.80	3.89	4.11	3.97	2.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	7	6	4	3.32	1292/1425	3.87	3.82	4.12	3.93	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	0	4	6	9	3.70	1259/1508	4.14	4.21	4.18	4.11	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	4	11	6	3.87	1490/1526	4.21	4.41	4.66	4.57	3.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	5	11	4	3.86	1082/1490	3.98	4.04	4.11	4.02	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	997/1428	4.46	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	1	17	4.50	1183/1436	4.68	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	8	6	3.73	1238/1427	4.07	4.16	4.32	4.27	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	7	8	3.86	1177/1425	3.98	4.10	4.34	4.31	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	6	7	4	3.63	1008/1291	3.75	3.91	4.05	3.97	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	0	5	12	4.25	644/1271	4.28	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	7	4	6	3.60	1128/1276	4.16	4.18	4.33	4.14	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	5	6	6	3.65	1126/1273	4.05	4.21	4.38	4.18	3.65
4. Were special techniques successful	5	9	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	823/922	3.80	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 03		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci					Questionnaires:	24
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 03
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 04	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	865/1528	4.04	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	8	6	3.78	1290/1527	4.08	4.14	4.28	4.23	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	925/1333	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.26	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	922/1495	4.10	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	11	8	4.18	727/1439	3.80	3.89	4.11	3.97	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	658/1425	3.87	3.82	4.12	3.93	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	3	8	9	4.00	1050/1508	4.14	4.21	4.18	4.11	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	7	10	4.23	1313/1526	4.21	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	4	2	12	5	3.78	1130/1490	3.98	4.04	4.11	4.02	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	931/1428	4.46	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	948/1436	4.68	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	7	8	3.91	1152/1427	4.07	4.16	4.32	4.27	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	6	11	3.91	1148/1425	3.98	4.10	4.34	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	2	4	5	9	3.65	998/1291	3.75	3.91	4.05	3.97	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	429/1271	4.28	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	540/1276	4.16	4.18	4.33	4.14	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	3	4	14	4.26	822/1273	4.05	4.21	4.38	4.18	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	328/922	3.80	3.86	4.02	3.87	4.32

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 04		Term - Fall 2010									Enrollment: 27	
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci											Questionnaires: 23	
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 04			Term - Fall 2010								Enrollment:	27	
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci											Questionnaires:	23	
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M													

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 05	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 27
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci			Questionnaires: 18
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	1	7	6	3.82	1270/1528	4.04	4.19	4.31	4.16	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	979/1527	4.08	4.14	4.28	4.23	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	3	10	4.06	977/1333	4.13	4.22	4.34	4.26	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	4	11	4.41	640/1495	4.10	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	818/1439	3.80	3.89	4.11	3.97	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	0	2	1	8	3.79	1069/1425	3.87	3.82	4.12	3.93	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	329/1508	4.14	4.21	4.18	4.11	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	1248/1526	4.21	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1005/1490	3.98	4.04	4.11	4.02	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	2	12	4.50	854/1428	4.46	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	917/1436	4.68	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	975/1427	4.07	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	3	7	3.63	1267/1425	3.98	4.10	4.34	4.31	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	4	2	4	5	3.50	1061/1291	3.75	3.91	4.05	3.97	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	1	8	3.75	961/1271	4.28	4.42	4.16	3.98	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	879/1276	4.16	4.18	4.33	4.14	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	746/1273	4.05	4.21	4.38	4.18	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	638/922	3.80	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.70

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 05
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101H 02		Term - Fall 2010							Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Engr Sci -Honors									Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M										

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	994/1528	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	393/1333	4.67	4.22	4.34	4.26	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	576/1495	4.45	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	7	7	3.95	907/1439	3.95	3.89	4.11	3.97	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	9	8	4.15	776/1425	4.15	3.82	4.12	3.93	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	517/1508	4.45	4.21	4.18	4.11	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	1231/1526	4.32	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	756/1490	4.19	4.04	4.11	4.02	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	686/1428	4.64	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	1102/1436	4.62	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	792/1427	4.38	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	12	4.18	981/1425	4.18	4.10	4.34	4.31	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	674/1291	4.11	3.91	4.05	3.97	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	389/1271	4.58	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	10	5	3.95	966/1276	3.95	4.18	4.33	4.14	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	988/1273	3.94	4.21	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	350/922	4.27	3.86	4.02	3.87	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101H 02	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 29
Title:	Intro Engr Sci -Honors			Questionnaires: 22
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	81/198	4.43	4.43	4.16	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	68/208	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	49/194	4.83	4.83	4.56	4.54	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	59/176	4.50	4.50	4.23	4.19	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101H 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	29
Title:	Intro Engr Sci -Honors		Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	0	to be significant			
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	27
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci		Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M			

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1140/1528	4.23	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	6	5	3.53	1401/1527	3.96	4.14	4.28	4.23	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	7	7	3.79	1153/1333	4.11	4.22	4.34	4.26	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1047/1495	4.13	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1090/1439	3.84	3.89	4.11	3.97	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	3	1	4	4	3.20	1317/1425	3.48	3.82	4.12	3.93	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	3	7	3.83	1185/1508	4.12	4.21	4.18	4.11	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	1061/1526	4.55	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	6	3	3.53	1263/1490	3.95	4.04	4.11	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	1072/1428	4.31	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	996/1436	4.39	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	2	8	4	3.50	1300/1427	4.03	4.16	4.32	4.27	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	4	7	3.83	1193/1425	4.03	4.10	4.34	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	2	6	5	3.59	1031/1291	4.02	3.91	4.05	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	664/1271	4.42	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	5	7	5	3.79	1049/1276	4.10	4.18	4.33	4.14	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	909/1273	4.27	4.21	4.38	4.18	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	851/922	3.64	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 27
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 02			Term - Fall 2010						Enrollment:	27
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci									Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M										

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 27
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor:	Arey,Anne W.		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1140/1528	4.23	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	6	5	3.53	1401/1527	3.96	4.14	4.28	4.23	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	7	7	3.79	1153/1333	4.11	4.22	4.34	4.26	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1047/1495	4.13	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1090/1439	3.84	3.89	4.11	3.97	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	3	1	4	4	3.20	1317/1425	3.48	3.82	4.12	3.93	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	3	7	3.83	1185/1508	4.12	4.21	4.18	4.11	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	1061/1526	4.55	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1118/1490	3.95	4.04	4.11	4.02	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1079/1428	4.31	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1382/1436	4.39	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1080/1427	4.03	4.16	4.32	4.27	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1193/1425	4.03	4.10	4.34	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	504/1291	4.02	3.91	4.05	3.97	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	664/1271	4.42	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	5	7	5	3.79	1049/1276	4.10	4.18	4.33	4.14	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	909/1273	4.27	4.21	4.38	4.18	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	851/922	3.64	3.86	4.02	3.87	3.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 02		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	27
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci					Questionnaires:	19
Instructor:	Arey,Anne W.						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 02
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Arey,Anne W.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 19

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 04	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci			Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	687/1528	4.23	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	748/1527	3.96	4.14	4.28	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	676/1333	4.11	4.22	4.34	4.26	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	13	11	4.25	844/1495	4.13	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	6	8	11	3.96	895/1439	3.84	3.89	4.11	3.97	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	10	7	3.77	1082/1425	3.48	3.82	4.12	3.93	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	586/1508	4.12	4.21	4.18	4.11	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	16	4.59	986/1526	4.55	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	281/1490	3.95	4.04	4.11	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	553/1428	4.31	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	774/1436	4.39	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	683/1427	4.03	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	589/1425	4.03	4.10	4.34	4.31	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	8	16	4.39	432/1291	4.02	3.91	4.05	3.97	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	349/1271	4.42	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	5	17	4.41	696/1276	4.10	4.18	4.33	4.14	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	689/1273	4.27	4.21	4.38	4.18	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	386/922	3.64	3.86	4.02	3.87	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 04	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci			Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M				

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 04				Term - Fall 2010							Enrollment:	30
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci											Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	5	A	10	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 04	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci			Questionnaires:	28
Instructor:	Bielawski,Cathe				

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	10	16	4.46	687/1528	4.23	4.19	4.31	4.16	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	748/1527	3.96	4.14	4.28	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	676/1333	4.11	4.22	4.34	4.26	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	13	11	4.25	844/1495	4.13	4.20	4.25	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	6	8	11	3.96	895/1439	3.84	3.89	4.11	3.97	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	10	7	3.77	1082/1425	3.48	3.82	4.12	3.93	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	586/1508	4.12	4.21	4.18	4.11	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	16	4.59	986/1526	4.55	4.41	4.66	4.57	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	7	9	5	3.90	1046/1490	3.95	4.04	4.11	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	1202/1428	4.31	4.45	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	1377/1436	4.39	4.59	4.74	4.70	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	1016/1427	4.03	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	6	9	3.86	1177/1425	4.03	4.10	4.34	4.31	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	2	5	6	8	3.82	895/1291	4.02	3.91	4.05	3.97	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	18	4.63	349/1271	4.42	4.42	4.16	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	5	17	4.41	696/1276	4.10	4.18	4.33	4.14	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	689/1273	4.27	4.21	4.38	4.18	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	386/922	3.64	3.86	4.02	3.87	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 04
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Bielawski,Cathe

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.19	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.82	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.10	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.74	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.09	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.68	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.51	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.33	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 04
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Bielawski,Cathe

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	5	A	10	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 200 1			Term - Fall 2010						Enrollment: 29				
Title:	Intro To Entrepreneurshp									Questionnaires: 23				
Instructor:	Rosenfeld,Micha													

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	448/1528	4.65	4.19	4.31	4.34	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	326/1527	4.70	4.14	4.28	4.32	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	500/1333	4.57	4.22	4.34	4.40	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	341/1495	4.64	4.20	4.25	4.28	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	573/1439	4.33	3.89	4.11	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	301/1425	4.60	3.82	4.12	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	380/1508	4.57	4.21	4.18	4.19	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	867/1526	4.71	4.41	4.66	4.64	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	389/1490	4.47	4.04	4.11	4.11	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	441/1428	4.77	4.45	4.49	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	258/1436	4.95	4.59	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	230/1427	4.81	4.16	4.32	4.33	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	208/1425	4.86	4.10	4.34	4.37	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	2	1	2	9	3.88	855/1291	3.88	3.91	4.05	4.14	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	204/1271	4.80	4.42	4.16	4.21	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	302/1276	4.80	4.18	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	345/1273	4.80	4.21	4.38	4.43	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	185/922	4.58	3.86	4.02	4.11	4.58

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 200 1
Title:	Intro To Entrepreneurshp
Instructor:	Rosenfeld,Micha

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	4.43	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	4.50	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.83	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.50	4.23	4.18	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENES 200 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 29
Title: Intro To Entrepreneurshp		Questionnaires: 23
Instructor: Rosenfeld,Micha		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	3						