

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	117

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	2	0	8	16	23	34	34	3.61	1363/1520	3.61	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	15	27	36	28	3.54	1368/1520	3.54	4.09	4.27	4.20	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	9	12	23	37	32	3.63	1151/1291	3.63	3.94	4.33	4.24	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	8	10	28	47	19	3.53	1323/1483	3.53	4.04	4.23	4.09	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	34	15	10	24	16	12	3.00	1348/1417	3.00	3.50	4.08	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	16	16	14	28	26	13	3.06	1325/1405	3.06	3.59	4.12	3.96	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	6	12	26	32	36	3.71	1238/1504	3.71	4.05	4.16	4.13	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	1	1	4	103	4.92	532/1519	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	6	18	27	34	15	3.34	1345/1495	3.51	4.07	4.11	4.01	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	4	17	29	60	4.23	1108/1459	4.27	4.62	4.47	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	9	14	89	4.66	1060/1460	4.64	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	9	12	24	38	29	3.59	1297/1455	3.76	4.15	4.32	4.26	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	10	13	24	30	35	3.60	1288/1456	3.69	4.18	4.34	4.26	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	11	11	7	22	23	32	3.61	1013/1316	3.70	3.95	4.03	3.91	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	5	15	34	44	4.07	751/1243	4.07	4.18	4.17	3.98	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	9	21	32	36	3.85	1012/1241	3.85	4.08	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	7	21	34	35	3.88	1024/1236	3.88	4.10	4.40	4.19	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	36	3	2	20	20	19	3.78	608/889	3.78	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	117

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	109	2	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	110	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	110	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	110	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	111	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	1	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	111	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	112	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	111	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	112	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	111	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	111	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	117

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	111	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	111	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	2	A	41	Required for Majors	95	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	45						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	117	Non-major	33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	20						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	117

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	2	0	8	16	23	34	34	3.61	1363/1520	3.61	4.21	4.31	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	15	27	36	28	3.54	1368/1520	3.54	4.09	4.27	4.20	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	9	12	23	37	32	3.63	1151/1291	3.63	3.94	4.33	4.24	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	8	10	28	47	19	3.53	1323/1483	3.53	4.04	4.23	4.09	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	34	15	10	24	16	12	3.00	1348/1417	3.00	3.50	4.08	4.02	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	16	16	14	28	26	13	3.06	1325/1405	3.06	3.59	4.12	3.96	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	6	12	26	32	36	3.71	1238/1504	3.71	4.05	4.16	4.13	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	1	1	4	103	4.92	532/1519	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	3	5	25	50	13	3.68	1195/1495	3.51	4.07	4.11	4.01	3.51
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	3	3	11	31	59	4.31	1055/1459	4.27	4.62	4.47	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	11	14	80	4.62	1096/1460	4.64	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	4	5	19	43	34	3.93	1135/1455	3.76	4.15	4.32	4.26	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	8	10	18	29	40	3.79	1220/1456	3.69	4.18	4.34	4.26	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	12	8	4	18	27	31	3.78	904/1316	3.70	3.95	4.03	3.91	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	5	15	34	44	4.07	751/1243	4.07	4.18	4.17	3.98	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	9	21	32	36	3.85	1012/1241	3.85	4.08	4.33	4.14	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	7	21	34	35	3.88	1024/1236	3.88	4.10	4.40	4.19	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	17	36	3	2	20	20	19	3.78	608/889	3.78	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	117

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	109	2	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	110	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	110	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	110	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	111	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	1	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	112	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	111	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	112	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	111	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	112	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	111	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	111	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	142
Questionnaires:	117

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	111	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	111	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	2	A	41	Required for Majors	95	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	45						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	117	Non-major	33
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	20						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101H 01
Title:	Intro Engr Sci -Honors
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	30

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	2	10	16	4.30	874/1520	4.30	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	9	15	4.23	912/1520	4.23	4.09	4.27	4.20	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	11	13	4.10	924/1291	4.10	3.94	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	13	12	4.17	895/1483	4.17	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	6	7	6	3.68	1083/1417	3.68	3.50	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	2	7	7	6	3.35	1263/1405	3.35	3.59	4.12	3.96	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	11	12	4.25	748/1504	4.25	4.05	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	7	10	9	4.00	891/1495	4.07	4.07	4.11	4.01	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	712/1459	4.70	4.62	4.47	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	727/1460	4.85	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	9	9	10	3.90	1162/1455	4.10	4.15	4.32	4.26	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	9	15	4.13	1033/1456	4.20	4.18	4.34	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	5	11	12	4.17	611/1316	4.19	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	12	8	3.96	799/1243	3.96	4.18	4.17	3.98	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	814/1241	4.19	4.08	4.33	4.14	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	5	7	11	3.92	1003/1236	3.92	4.10	4.40	4.19	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	3	0	5	3	4	3.33	757/889	3.33	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101H 01
Title:	Intro Engr Sci -Honors
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	30

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	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101H 01
Title:	Intro Engr Sci -Honors
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	30

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	2	10	16	4.30	874/1520	4.30	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	9	15	4.23	912/1520	4.23	4.09	4.27	4.20	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	11	13	4.10	924/1291	4.10	3.94	4.33	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	13	12	4.17	895/1483	4.17	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	6	7	6	3.68	1083/1417	3.68	3.50	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	2	7	7	6	3.35	1263/1405	3.35	3.59	4.12	3.96	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	11	12	4.25	748/1504	4.25	4.05	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	15	8	4.15	780/1495	4.07	4.07	4.11	4.01	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	374/1459	4.70	4.62	4.47	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	648/1460	4.85	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	14	13	4.30	877/1455	4.10	4.15	4.32	4.26	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	13	14	4.27	936/1456	4.20	4.18	4.34	4.26	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	14	10	4.21	577/1316	4.19	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	12	8	3.96	799/1243	3.96	4.18	4.17	3.98	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	814/1241	4.19	4.08	4.33	4.14	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	5	7	11	3.92	1003/1236	3.92	4.10	4.40	4.19	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	3	0	5	3	4	3.33	757/889	3.33	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101H 01
Title:	Intro Engr Sci -Honors
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	30

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	28	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

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	8	12	4.41	755/1520	4.41	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	948/1520	4.19	4.09	4.27	4.20	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	9	6	3.73	1112/1291	3.73	3.94	4.33	4.24	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	11	7	4.05	990/1483	4.05	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	8	5	3.68	1083/1417	3.68	3.50	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	11	4	3.81	1043/1405	3.81	3.59	4.12	3.96	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	10	7	4.05	965/1504	4.05	4.05	4.16	4.13	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	738/1495	4.26	4.07	4.11	4.01	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	616/1459	4.70	4.62	4.47	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	806/1460	4.80	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	2	12	4.10	1032/1455	4.26	4.15	4.32	4.26	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	1056/1456	4.26	4.18	4.34	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	698/1316	4.05	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	6	9	4.11	732/1243	4.11	4.18	4.17	3.98	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	3	6	6	3.72	1068/1241	3.72	4.08	4.33	4.14	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	932/1236	4.06	4.10	4.40	4.19	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	709/889	3.50	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

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	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	LaBerge,E F

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1 F 1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

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	8	12	4.41	755/1520	4.41	4.21	4.31	4.14	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	948/1520	4.19	4.09	4.27	4.20	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	9	6	3.73	1112/1291	3.73	3.94	4.33	4.24	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	11	7	4.05	990/1483	4.05	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	8	5	3.68	1083/1417	3.68	3.50	4.08	4.02	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	11	4	3.81	1043/1405	3.81	3.59	4.12	3.96	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	10	7	4.05	965/1504	4.05	4.05	4.16	4.13	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	568/1495	4.26	4.07	4.11	4.01	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	498/1459	4.70	4.62	4.47	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	845/1460	4.80	4.80	4.74	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	736/1455	4.26	4.15	4.32	4.26	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	767/1456	4.26	4.18	4.34	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	698/1316	4.05	3.95	4.03	3.91	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	6	9	4.11	732/1243	4.11	4.18	4.17	3.98	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	3	6	6	3.72	1068/1241	3.72	4.08	4.33	4.14	3.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	932/1236	4.06	4.10	4.40	4.19	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	709/889	3.50	3.65	4.02	3.89	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

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	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.13	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.99	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENES 101Y 01
Title:	Intro Engineering Sci
Instructor:	Spence,Anne M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	22

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	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.14	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

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	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	212/1520	4.83	4.21	4.31	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	271/1520	4.74	4.09	4.27	4.34	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	395/1291	4.65	3.94	4.33	4.44	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	158/1483	4.83	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	1028/1417	3.78	3.50	4.08	4.14	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	219/1405	4.68	3.59	4.12	4.13	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	656/1504	4.33	4.05	4.16	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	16	4	4.04	1423/1519	4.04	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	118/1495	4.83	4.07	4.11	4.16	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.62	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.80	4.74	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	226/1455	4.84	4.15	4.32	4.39	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	100/1456	4.95	4.18	4.34	4.46	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	912/1316	3.78	3.95	4.03	4.18	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.18	4.17	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.08	4.33	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.10	4.40	4.45	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

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
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	292/889	4.33	3.65	4.02	3.99	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 19	Required for Majors	5 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 24 Non-major 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	10
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 3		

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