

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 688  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	8	8	4.10	1089/1576	4.24	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	1032/1576	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	827/1342	4.34	4.34	4.32	4.19	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	848/1520	4.31	4.31	4.25	4.09	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	7	5	3.68	1152/1465	3.71	3.71	4.12	4.02	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1087/1434	3.70	3.70	4.14	3.94	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	963/1547	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.10	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	795/1574	4.45	4.45	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	623/1554	4.24	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	786/1488	4.66	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	708/1493	4.78	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	988/1486	4.42	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	856/1489	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	6	9	4.17	608/1277	4.43	4.43	4.03	3.91	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	712/1279	4.09	4.09	4.17	3.96	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	982/1270	3.83	3.83	4.35	4.09	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	915/1269	3.98	3.98	4.35	4.09	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	725/ 878	3.92	3.92	4.05	3.91	3.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	201/ 234	4.31	4.31	4.23	4.08	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 240	4.54	4.54	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 229	4.50	4.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 232	4.75	4.75	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 379	4.44	4.44	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 72	4.17	4.17	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 375	4.33	4.33	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 326	3.67	3.67	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 40	4.50	4.50	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 24	4.33	4.33	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 28	4.33	4.33	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 382	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 688  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	1	14	4.42	757/1576	4.24	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	6	11	4.32	877/1576	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	620/1342	4.34	4.34	4.32	4.19	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	562/1520	4.31	4.31	4.25	4.09	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1043/1465	3.71	3.71	4.12	4.02	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	7	5	3.79	1075/1434	3.70	3.70	4.14	3.94	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	1041/1547	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	18	4.79	702/1574	4.45	4.45	4.64	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	732/1554	4.24	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.66	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	888/1493	4.78	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	584/1486	4.42	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	867/1489	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	278/1277	4.43	4.43	4.03	3.91	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	1	14	4.53	432/1279	4.09	4.09	4.17	3.96	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	865/1270	3.83	3.83	4.35	4.09	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	830/1269	3.98	3.98	4.35	4.09	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	339/ 878	3.92	3.92	4.05	3.91	4.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	50/ 234	4.31	4.31	4.23	4.08	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	91/ 240	4.54	4.54	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	172/ 229	4.50	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 232	4.75	4.75	4.29	4.27	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 379	4.44	4.44	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	4.17	4.17	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	4.33	4.33	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	3.67	3.67	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	4.50	4.50	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	4.33	4.33	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	4.33	4.33	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 689  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0103  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 690  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	3	9	11	4.16	1042/1576	4.24	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	958/1576	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	5	12	4.12	925/1342	4.34	4.34	4.32	4.19	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	11	9	4.04	1022/1520	4.31	4.31	4.25	4.09	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	7	5	6	3.28	1331/1465	3.71	3.71	4.12	4.02	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	9	4	5	3.41	1263/1434	3.70	3.70	4.14	3.94	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	12	4	9	3.88	1159/1547	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	972/1574	4.45	4.45	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	849/1554	4.24	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	774/1488	4.66	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	1006/1493	4.78	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	4	13	4.21	996/1486	4.42	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	4	13	4.13	1050/1489	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	412/1277	4.43	4.43	4.03	3.91	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	7	11	4.09	777/1279	4.09	4.09	4.17	3.96	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	1	5	4	10	3.74	1062/1270	3.83	3.83	4.35	4.09	3.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	0	2	5	13	4.09	911/1269	3.98	3.98	4.35	4.09	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	446/ 878	3.92	3.92	4.05	3.91	4.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 234	4.31	4.31	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 240	4.54	4.54	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 229	4.50	4.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 232	4.75	4.75	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 379	4.44	4.44	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 72	4.17	4.17	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 375	4.33	4.33	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	3.67	3.67	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	4.50	4.50	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	4.33	4.33	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	4.33	4.33	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0103  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 690  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	2	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0104  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 691  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	916/1576	4.24	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	1040/1576	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	726/1342	4.34	4.34	4.32	4.19	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	880/1520	4.31	4.31	4.25	4.09	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1004/1465	3.71	3.71	4.12	4.02	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	10	3	3.70	1123/1434	3.70	3.70	4.14	3.94	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	900/1547	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	15	2	4.00	1459/1574	4.45	4.45	4.64	4.59	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	712/1554	4.24	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	786/1488	4.66	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	1029/1493	4.78	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	792/1486	4.42	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	910/1489	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	201/1277	4.43	4.43	4.03	3.91	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	4	1	5	6	3.81	934/1279	4.09	4.09	4.17	3.96	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	982/1270	3.83	3.83	4.35	4.09	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	999/1269	3.98	3.98	4.35	4.09	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	464/ 878	3.92	3.92	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	63/ 234	4.31	4.31	4.23	4.08	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	79/ 240	4.54	4.54	4.35	4.29	4.58	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	93/ 229	4.50	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	103/ 232	4.75	4.75	4.29	4.27	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 379	4.44	4.44	4.20	4.15	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.52	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	52/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.52	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	58/ 72	4.17	4.17	4.64	4.43	4.17	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.61	4.55	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	171/ 375	4.33	4.33	4.01	3.78	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	38/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.72	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	3.67	4.03	3.64	3.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	27/ 40	4.50	4.50	4.60	4.44	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	22/ 24	4.33	4.33	4.83	4.71	4.33	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	29/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.68	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	24/ 28	4.33	4.33	4.78	4.65	4.33	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	185/ 382	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.86	4.00	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0104  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 691  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 101 0105  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 692  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	4	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	976/1576	4.24	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	785/1576	4.25	4.25	4.27	4.18	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	633/1342	4.34	4.34	4.32	4.19	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	476/1520	4.31	4.31	4.25	4.09	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1035/1465	3.71	3.71	4.12	4.02	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1039/1434	3.70	3.70	4.14	3.94	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	592/1547	4.13	4.13	4.19	4.10	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	1434/1574	4.45	4.45	4.64	4.59	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	692/1554	4.24	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	484/1488	4.66	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.78	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1486	4.42	4.42	4.32	4.26	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	834/1489	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	463/1277	4.43	4.43	4.03	3.91	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	934/1279	4.09	4.09	4.17	3.96	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	6	2	2	3.36	1163/1270	3.83	3.83	4.35	4.09	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1076/1269	3.98	3.98	4.35	4.09	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	631/ 878	3.92	3.92	4.05	3.91	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 234	4.31	4.31	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 240	4.54	4.54	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 229	4.50	4.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 232	4.75	4.75	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 379	4.44	4.44	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 85	4.50	4.50	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 72	4.17	4.17	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 375	4.33	4.33	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 326	3.67	3.67	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 40	4.50	4.50	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 24	4.33	4.33	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 28	4.33	4.33	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 382	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0105  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 692  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						