Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

PENCE, ANNE M Fall 2005 24 Page 843 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	703/1674	4.44	4.05	4.27	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.14	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	335/1423	4.69	4.16	4.27	4.36	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	466/1609	4.53	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	936/1585	3.88	3.60	3.96	3.91	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	8	5		1092/1535	3.82	4.02	4.08	4.03	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3		4.17	966/1651	4.17	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	12			1566/1673	4.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	274/1656	4.64	4.01	4.07	4.10	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	560/1586	4.72	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	981/1585	4.72	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0			4.67		4.67	4.09		4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6		4.56	635/1575	4.56	4.02	4.27	4.39	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	241/1380	4.60	3.82	3.94	4.03	4.60
J. Did additivibual teelmiques elmanee your understanding	_	2	O	O	U	O		1.00	211/1300	1.00	3.02	3.71	1.03	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	443/1520	4.47	3.68	4.01	4.03	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	543/1515	4.60	3.85	4.24	4.28	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	358/1511	4.80	3.97	4.27	4.28	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	445/ 994	4.10	3.82	3.94	3.98	4.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0			4.86	31/ 265	4.86	4.61	4.23	4.34	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	49/ 278	4.69	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1		4.77	74/ 260	4.77	4.58	4.46		4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	28/ 259	4.92	4.82	4.33		4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	41/ 233	4.75	4.69	4.20	4.48	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 101	4.80	4.93	4.48	4.45	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	37/ 97	4.60	4.80	4.14	4.63	4.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	4.20	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27	4.82	****
G-16 Pared														
Self Paced	1 4	^	-		-	-	-	2 25		الدياد الإيلان	4 15	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.23	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	4.23	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52 ****/ 50	****	4.67	4.26	4.53	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	2	1.00	, 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students 	14 14	1 1	0	0	1 1	1	1 1		****/ 35 ****/ 31	****	5.00	4.36	4.63 4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	T	U	U	Т	Т	Т	4.00	/ 31		5.00	4.34	4.50	

Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment:

24 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 843 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	ned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101 University of Maryland Title STRUCT/PROP: ENGR MATER Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC

Enrollment: 70 Questionnaires: 37

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 844

Job IRBR3029

	<u> -</u>				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	4	9	20	4.41	751/1674	4.41	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	4	12	14	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	4	4	9	17	4.15	929/1423	4.15	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	825/1609	4.27	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	2	7	8	13	4.07	728/1585	4.07	3.60	3.96	3.95	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	11	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	548/1535	4.36	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	7	24	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	359/1656	4.53	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	301/1586	4.85	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	170/1585	4.97	4.42	4.69	4.66	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	1	13	17	4.29	892/1582	4.29	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	8	19	4.32	895/1575	4.32	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	4	4	25	4.53	290/1380	4.53	3.82	3.94	4.01	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00.07											0			

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32	_			
				?	1						

ENME 303 OIOI

TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 9

Title

AKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. A) Fall

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Page 845 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1449/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1284/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	950/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1411/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1406/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1467/1651	3.39	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1412/1656	2.62	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	663/1586	4.13	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1472/1585	3.15	4.42	4.69	4.66	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1244/1582	2.95	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1487/1575	2.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	845/1380	3.35	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	810/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1341/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1333/1511	3.13	3.97	4.27	4.34	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	207/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	233/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.00		4.46	4.49	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 259	5.00		4.33	4.33	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.69		4.18	5.00
	_	_	-	-		-	-		_,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.10	****
J J														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27		****
o. Did conferences help you odily out lies desivioles	•	_	_	Ü	ŭ	Ū	Ū		, 22		1.05	1.27	3.27	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 50	****	5.00		3.82	****
		-	-	_	-	_	-		, 30		,			

TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 26

Baltimore County ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. A)

Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 845 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Title Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 9

Baltimore County Fall 2005

University of Maryland

Page 846 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1449/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1284/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	950/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1411/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1406/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2			1467/1651	3.39		4.18	4.16	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3			1072/1673	4.67		4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	0			****/1656			4.07	4.07	3.43
,									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1586	4.13	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	0	1		1564/1585	3.15	4.42	4.69	4.66	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1582	2.95	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1575	2.42	4.02	4.27		3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	0	2		666/1380		3.82		4.01	
J. Did dudiovibual commiques emance your understanding	Ü	Ü	0	_	O	O	-	1.00	000/1300	3.33	3.02	3.71	1.01	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	810/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	0	2		1341/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	2		1333/1511	3.13	3.97		4.34	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 994	****		3.94	3.96	****
1. Were appeared teermingues adocessari	-	-	0	O	O	O	_	3.00	, ,,,,,,,,		3.02	3.71	3.70	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	207/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	233/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 259	5.00		4.33	4.33	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.69		4.18	5.00
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	-	2	O	O	O	O	J	3.00	1/ 255	3.00	1.05	1.20	1.10	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.10	****
1. Note appropries to the announced one and	,	Ū	Ū	_	ŭ	Ū	_	3.30	, 100		3.73		1.10	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 49	****		4.27	3.27	****
J. Dia conferences help jou carry out richa activities	,	_	_	J	J	J	J	1.00	, 10		1.03	1.2/	5.27	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	3.20	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 50	****	5.00		3.82	****
J. Hele four contacts with the impliateon helpful	,	5	5	_	5	_	J	5.00	, 50		5.00	1.11	5.02	

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor:

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 9

ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. B) Fall 2005

Baltimore County

Page 846

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 847 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	3	3	1	2.67	1656/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	2	3	2		1639/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	5		1150/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	930/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	2	1		1164/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1083/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1540/1651	3.39	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.67	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	3	2	3	1	0	2.22	1637/1656	2.62	4.01	4.07	4.07	2.22
T a selection														
Lecture	1	0	1	1	1	1	-	4 00	1055/1506	4 12	4 45	4 42	4 40	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	Τ	Τ.	Ţ	1		1255/1586		4.45	4.43	4.42	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	7	2	5 1	2	1		1574/1585	3.15 2.95	4.42	4.69	4.66	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3 4	4	1	0	3		1560/1582 1550/1575	2.95	4.09	4.26 4.27	4.26	2.64 2.45
	0 1	U	2	3	0	J	2							
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	U	2	3	U	3	3	3.18	1184/1380	3.35	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	2	2	1	2.75	1434/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	0	0	3	2	3.13	1409/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.13	3.97	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material		0	Λ	Λ	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11 11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 260	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.33	****
1. Did the last imperator provide approxime	11	Ü	3	3	J	3	-	3.00	, 233	5.00	1.02	1.33	1.33	

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Time 11 man 1:

AKKAF, IBRAH Fall 2005

Page 848 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	cies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	3	2	2	0	2.18	1668/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	2.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	2	1		1630/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1316/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1557/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1543/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1083/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	1442/1651	3.39	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.67	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	5	3	0	0	2.22	1637/1656	2.62	4.01	4.07	4.07	2.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	6	2	3 64	1451/1586	4.13	4.45	4.43	4.42	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	3	4	1	0		1584/1585	3.15	4.42	4.69	4.66	2.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	3	2	0		1573/1582	2.95	4.09	4.26	4.26	2.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	5	0	1	0		1571/1575	2.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	1.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	5	3	1	0		1338/1380			3.94		
~.														
Discussion		0	_	•	0	_	-	2 20	1004/1500	2 52	2 60	4 01	4 00	2 20
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	5	1		1234/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	3	1	1		1460/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	2	1	Ţ		1470/1511	3.13	3.97	4.27	4.34	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	-7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 260	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	5.00	4.69	4.20	4.18	****
		_	-	-	-	_	-		, _55				3	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-	_		
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 849

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 34
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101

MACHINE DESIGN

FARQUHAR, TONY

Title

Instructor:

		0						eque:			_		tructor		e Dept		Level	Sec
		Questions 	3 		NR	NA	1	2	3	-4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General	L															
. Did you g	gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	3	0	0	2	4	14	11		1123/167		4.05	4.27	4.26	4.
. Did the i	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	3	0	2	5	5	12	7	3.55	1479/1674	3.55	4.14	4.23	4.21	3.
. Did the e	exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	4	0	1	1	6	7	15	4.13	936/1423	3 4.13	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.
. Did other	evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	1	1	1	4	12	11	4.07	1055/1609	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.
. Did assig	gned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	3	9	4	5	6	3	4	2.91	1491/158	2.91	3.60	3.96	3.95	2.
. Did writt	en ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	3	6	1	4	8	9	3	3.36	1345/153	3.36	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.
. Was the g	grading	g system clearly	/ expla	ined	3	0	2	4	7	9	9	3.61	1398/1653	3.61	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.
. How many	times	was class cance	elled		4	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	778/1673	3 4.87	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.
. How would	d you g	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	1	2	3	8	10	2	3.28	1462/1656	3.28	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.
		Lecture	2															
. Were the	instru	actor's lectures	well :	prepared	5	0	2	1	7	10	9	3.79	1403/1586	3.79	4.45	4.43	4.42	3.
. Did the i	instruc	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	917/158	4.75	4.42	4.69	4.66	4.
. Was lectu	ıre mat	terial presented	and e	xplained clearly	5	0	4	6	9	6	4	3.00	1504/1582	2 3.00	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.
. Did the l	lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	6	0	3	1	6	8	10	3.75	1289/157	3.75	4.02	4.27	4.25	3.
. Did audio	ovisual	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	7	16	3	2	5	0	1	2.45	1331/1380	2.45	3.82	3.94	4.01	2.
	Discussion class discussions contribute to wh																	
. Did class	class discussions contribute to what you				22	0	3	1	3	0	5	3.25	1284/1520	3.25	3.68	4.01	4.09	3.
. Were all	re all students actively encouraged to particip				21	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1386/151	3.23	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.
	e all students actively encouraged to participal the instructor encourage fair and open discuss				21	0	3	2	1	3			1375/1513		3.97	4.27	4.34	3.
	oid the instructor encourage fair and open discuss Dere special techniques successful						1	1	3	0			****/ 99			3.94		* *
		Laborat	cory															
. Were you	provid	ded with adequat	e back	ground information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	* *
		Field W																
		rience contribut			32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	5 ****	4.00	3.98	4.03	* *
. Did you c	clearly	y understand you	ır eval	uation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 7	7 ****	4.33	3.93	3.70	* *
. Was the i	instruc	ctor available f	or con	sultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	3 ****	5.00	4.45	3.87	* *
. To what d	degree	could you discu	ıss you	r evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	3 ****	5.00	4.12	3.67	* *
		Self I																
	_	-		what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, .		4.17	4.09	3.20	**
. Were your	conta	acts with the ir	nstruct	or helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50) ****	5.00	4.44	3.82	**
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earn	ned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			T	уре			Majors	5		
00-27							quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	`	0	Graduat	 :е	0	Majo	 or	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 10			_			-						,		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 4		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-	grad :	34	Non-	-major	
													-				-	
						Ele	ecti	ves				0		Means to l			_	gh
				I 0		O+1	her				2	8	respons	ו טו פטע	عر معرا	ıııcal	10	

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101 University of Maryland Page 850 FLUID MECHANICS Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Questionnaires: 29

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	2	13	13	4.31	878/1674	4.31	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.31
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	3	12	13	4.24	943/1674	4.24	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.24
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	760/1423	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.34
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	3	3	1	5	8	9	3.73	1334/1609	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.73
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	1	3	4	5	7	3.70	1093/1585	3.70	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.70
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	3	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1256/1535	3.58	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.58
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	1	15	11	4.21	924/1651	4.21	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.21
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	11	17	4.61	1135/1673	4.61	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.61
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	13	6	3.81	1200/1656	3.81	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.81
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.57
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	1	3	3	20		1183/1585		4.42	4.69	4.66	4.56
				explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	13	10		1079/1582		4.09	4.26	4.26	4.11
					1	0	1	1	2	13	11	4.14	1060/1575	4.14	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.14
5. Did au	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				3	3	1	1	11	5	5	3.52	1028/1380	3.52	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.52
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.09	****
				d to participate	23	0	1	0	2	1	2		****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.32	****
				d open discussion	23	0	1	0	1	3	1		****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.34	****
		chniques succe		a open arboabbien	23	3	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 994	****	3.82			****
																		
				Frequ	lency	DIS	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1					Re	guir	ed f	or M	aior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9			1				_	-		_	-	5	_	•
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C 7		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	19	Non-	-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D 1									5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot:	her				2	17	-					
				? 0														

Title TRANSFER PROCESSES

Instructor: MA, RONGHUI

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 851 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	570/167	4 4.54	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.54
_	-	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	270/167		4.14	4.23	4.21	4.75
		uestions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85			4.16	4.27	4.27	4.85
	_	uations reflect			1	2	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1029/160	9 4.10	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.10
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	te to w	hat you learned	0	4	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1376/158	5 3.22	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.22
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	832/153	5 4.09	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.09
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	explair	ned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	220/165	1 4.77	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.77
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/167	3 5.00	4.71	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	1 teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	324/165	6 4.58	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.58
		Lecture	<u>.</u>															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	336/158	6 4.83	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.83
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	737/158	5 4.83	4.42	4.69	4.66	4.83
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	and ex	plained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	546/158	2 4.58	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.58
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	806/157	5 4.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.42
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	2	8	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/138	0 ****	3.82	3.94	4.01	****
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	te to w	hat you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/152	0 ****	3.68	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively enc	ouraged	to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/151	5 ****	3.85	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did th	e all students actively encouraged to participat the instructor encourage fair and open discussi			open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/151	1 ****	3.97	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were s	id the instructor encourage fair and open discussi ere special techniques successful				11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	4 ****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****
		Laborat	ory															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understan	ding of	the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 26	5 ****	4.61	4.23	4.26	****
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	.e backg:	round information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	8 ****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****
	_			r lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 26		4.58	4.46	4.49	****
		structor provide			12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 25		4.82	4.33	4.33	****
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	rts clea	arly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	3 ****	4.69	4.20	4.18	****
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	3 ****	3.75	4.41	4.10	****
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available f	or indi	vidual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	1 ****	4.93	4.48	4.30	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribu	te to w	hat you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 9!	5 ****	4.33	4.31	3.91	****
		Field W	iork															
	_	rience contribut		_	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		4.00	3.98	4.03	****
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand you	r evalua	ation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 7'	7 ****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****
	F				ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons				T	ype			Majors	5
00-27						Poo			or Ma			0	Gradua		 0	Majo		0
28-55						već	1u116	=u 1()ı Ma	בטנ.	D	U	Gradua	LC	U	Ma JC) <u> </u>	U
56-83						Ger	neral	L				0	Under-	grad	13	Non-	-major	0
84-150						001		_				-	011401	~~		2.011		ŭ
Grad.						$El\epsilon$	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### -	Means	there a	re not	enou	_i h
				P 0										ses to 1			_	-
P U					O+1	202				1	1	-						

Other

11

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County
Fall 2005

Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8

Ouestionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 852

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.00 1196/1674 4.35 4.05 4.27 4.26 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 2 4 4.29 894/1674 4.19 4.14 4.23 4.21 4.29 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1131/1423 3.73 4.16 4.27 4.27 3.86 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 985/1609 4.17 4.17 4.22 4.27 4.14 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 0 1 0 2 3.50 1223/1585 3.42 3.60 3.96 3.95 3.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 5 1 3.86 1066/1535 4.26 4.02 4.08 4.15 3.86 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 2 1 2 2 3.57 1414/1651 3.89 4.14 4.18 4.16 3.57 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 1015/1673 4.76 4.71 4.69 4.68 4.71 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 615/1656 4.48 4.01 4.07 4.07 4.42Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 301/1586 4.88 4.45 4.43 4.42 4.86 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 7 \quad 5.00$ 1/1585 5.00 4.42 4.69 4.66 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 199/1582 4.68 4.09 4.26 4.26 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 612/1575 4.59 4.02 4.27 4.25 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 4 0 1 1 1 0 3.00 1217/1380 3.00 3.82 3.94 4.01 3.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 1353/1520 3.00 3.68 4.01 4.09 3.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 1 1 4.50 629/1515 4.50 3.85 4.24 4.32 4.50 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 00 0 0 2 5.00 1/1511 5.00 3.97 4.27 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 5 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 994 **** 3.82 3.94 3.96 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 93/265 4.69 4.61 4.23 4.26 4.50 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 130/ 278 4.48 4.34 4.19 4.24 4.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 137/260 4.63 4.58 4.46 4.49 4.50 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 89/259 4.58 4.82 4.33 4.33 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 72/ 233 4.50 4.69 4.20 4.18 4.50 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 101 **** 4.93 4.48 4.30 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 95 **** 4.33 4.31 3.91 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 76 **** 4.00 3.98 4.03 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 77 **** 4.33 3.93 3.70 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 49 **** 4.83 4.27 3.27 **** Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Majors ______ 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 в 4 General 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 0 Under-grad 7 Non-major 0 3.00-3.49 3 3.50-4.00 2 D 0 84-150 4 Grad. F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant 7 Other

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 853

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. B) Fall 2005

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1196/1674	4.35	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	894/1674	4.19	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.29
3. Did th	ie exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1131/1423	3.73	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.86
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	985/1609	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.1
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.42	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.5
5. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1066/1535	4.26	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.8
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1414/1651	3.89	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.5
3. How ma	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1015/1673	4.76	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.7
How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	all teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.48	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.4
		Discus	ssion															
. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.68	4.01	4.09	3.0
. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	ncourage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.85	4.24	4.32	4.5
. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.34	5.0	
. Were s	pecial te		5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	***		
		Labora	atory															
l. Did th	e lab inc	crease understa	_	of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	93/ 265	4.69	4.61	4.23	4.26	4.5
. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	ate back	ground information	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	130/ 278	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.3
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	137/ 260	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.5
1. Did th	e lab ins	structor provid	de assis	stance	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.58	4.82	4.33	4.33	4.6
. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	ports cl	early specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.18	4.5
		Semina	ar															
2. Was th	e instruc	ctor available	for ind	lividual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.30	***
3. Did re	search pr	rojects contrik	oute to	what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.33	4.31	3.91	***
		Field	Work															
. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	***
. Did yo	u clearly	y understand yo	our eval	uation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	* * *
. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	ry out f	ield activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	***	4.83	4.27	3.27	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Τy	pe			Majors	\$	
00-27 28-55	0 1	A 2 B 4		Red	quir	ea I	or Ma	ijors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0		
56-83	0	Б 4 С 0		Co	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	0		
84-150	4	D 0		Gel	пета	т				U	onder-9	ı au	,	INOII-	iia jui	U		
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	3 2	Б 0 F 0		₽1.	ecti [.]	170C				0	#### -	Means +	hara a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		ъl	CCLI	veb				U	#### - respons				_	111
				I O		∩+1	her					7	respoils	LD LU L	o argii	ıııcal	10	
		T 0		ULI	TICI					,								

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102 University of Maryland Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB Baltimore County

AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 854

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque:	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	\$		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.35	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.70
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1077/1674		4.14	4.23	4.21	4.10
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	2	3	2	3		1249/1423	3.73	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.60
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	930/1609	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.20
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to wha	at you learned	0	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.42	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.26	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.67
	-	g system clearly	_	ed	0	0	0	1	2	1	6		934/1651	3.89	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	8		887/1673	4.76	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.48	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.53
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well pro	epared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.88	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.90
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.66	5.00
		terial presented			0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1582	4.68	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.50
		es contribute to	_		0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1575	4.59	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.60
5. Did au	audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:				0	5	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to wha	at you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	3.00	3.68	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	ouraged	to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	4.50	3.85	4.24	4.32	****
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage f	air and	open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1511	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	sful		8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****
		Laborat	ory															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understan	ding of	the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 265	4.69	4.61	4.23	4.26	4.88
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequat	e backgr	ound information	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	67/ 278	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.63
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avail	able for	lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	77/ 260	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.75
4. Did th	e lab ins	structor provide	assista	nce	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	115/ 259	4.58	4.82	4.33	4.33	4.50
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	rts clea	rly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.18	4.50
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
												- 						
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55						~		,				0	***** ·		0	37		0
56-83						Ge	nera	Т				0	Under-g	raa 1	.0	Non-	major	0
84-150 Grad.						רקד	ecti					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	*** ***		h
Grad.	ad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					ET.	ecrt,	ves				U	respons				_	11
				I 0		O+1	har					9	respons	es to L	e sign	ııııcan	ıL	
				5 U		Other						J						
				r U														

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. B) Fall 2005

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 855

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.35	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1077/1674	4.19	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1249/1423	3.73	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	930/1609	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.42	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.26	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	934/1651	3.89	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	887/1673	4.76	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.48	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	4.88	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	4.68	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1575	4.59	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	3.00	3.68	4.01	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	4.50	3.85	4.24	4.32	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1511	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	***	3.82	3.94	3.96	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 265	4.69	4.61	4.23	4.26	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	67/ 278	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	77/ 260	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	4		115/ 259	4.58	4.82	4.33	4.33	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.18	4.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101 University of Maryland AUTOMATIC CONTROLS Baltimore County

Title Instructor: TASCH, URI Fall 2005

Enrollment: 37 Questionnaires: 32 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cour	rse	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goal	ls	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	207/1674	4.81	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goa	als	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	310/1423	4.72	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goal	ls	0	14	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you le	earned	1	10	2	3	4	7	5	3.48	1245/1585	3.48	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you	learned	0	16	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	223/1535	4.69	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	3	4	25	4.69	309/1651	4.69	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	19	12		1354/1673		4.71			4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effect	tiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	178/1656	4.77	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.77
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		2	0	0	0	Ο	7	23	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subjection	ect	2	0	0	0	0	2			397/1585	4.93	4.42	4.69	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained cl		2	0	0	0	1	9		4.63	481/1582	4.63	4.09	4.26		4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	_	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1575		4.02	4.27	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your underst		2	5	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	213/1380	4.64	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.64
Discussion	,	0.0	0	0	-	0	_	2	2 00	006/1500	2 00	2 60	4 01	4 10	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you le		23	0	0	1 1	2 1	3	3	3.89	936/1520	3.89 4.11	3.68	4.01	4.18	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to partic 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open disc		23 23	0	0	0	⊥ 4	3	4		987/1515 1210/1511	3.78	3.85 3.97	4.24 4.27	4.40 4.45	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	cussion	23	8	0	0	0	3 1	0		****/ 994					3.78 ****
4. Were special techniques successivi		23	0	U	U	U		U	4.00	/ 994		3.02	3.94	4.19	
	Freque	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	d 0d				D = =		_			П	_			M	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	u Grades 				кеа	son	s 			Тур	e 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A	19		Rec	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B	8														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C	1		Ger	neral	_				0	Under-gr	ad 3	2	Non-	major	6
84-150 18 3.00-3.49 14 D	0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F	0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - M				_	h
P	0									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	it	
I	0		Oth	ner				2	8						
?	1	Other													

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 856

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

University of Maryland MECH: DEFORMABLE BODIE Baltimore County Fall 2005

Title Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 857 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	Ω	Ο	5	7	5	4 00	1196/1674	4.00	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	6		1068/1674	4.12	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	551/1423	4.53	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	3	4		1266/1609	3.83	4.17	4.22	4.30	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	5	4	3		1223/1585	3.50	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	5	6	2		1140/1535		4.02	4.08	4.18	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	5		1276/1651	3.82	4.14	4.18	4.23	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	4	0	3.25	1474/1656	3.25	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.25
Lecture	0	0	•	•	2		1.0	4 41	000/1506	4 41	4 45	4 42	4 46	4 41
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	,			4.43	4.46	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	3	10		1341/1585	4.35	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	3	1		1181/1582	3.94	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	7	4		1284/1575		4.02	4.27	4.35	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	Τ	0	2	4	1	7	3.93	770/1380	3.93	3.82	3.94	4.04	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.86	****
1. Dia liela emperienza concribaca do mias fou learned		3	3	_	3	0	Ü	2.00	, , ,		1.00	3.70	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	***	4.67	4.26	5.00	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	utior	1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101

Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB

Instructor: ZHU, LIANG

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 858 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions I				-	ncies				ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1674	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1423	4.68	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.57	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	557/1585	4.25	3.60	3.96	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1535	4.01	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	393/1651	4.58	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.46	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	663/1586	4.68	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	438/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.43	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1470/1520	3.75	3.68	4.01	4.18	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.25	3.85	4.24	4.40	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.45	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	4.00	3.82	3.94	4.19	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 265	4.78	4.61	4.23	4.53	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.21	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	119/ 260	4.68	4.58	4.46	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 259	4.88	4.82	4.33	4.31	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 233	4.65	4.69	4.20	4.10	4.80

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

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102 University of Maryland Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2005

Instructor: ZHU, LIANG

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Page 859 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	298/1674	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	161/1674	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.68	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	136/1609	4.57	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1585	4.25	3.60	3.96	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1342/1535	4.01	4.02	4.08	4.18	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1651	4.58	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.46	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.68	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	689/1585	4.67	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	932/1575	4.43	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	540/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	42/ 265	4.78	4.61	4.23	4.53	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.21	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	77/ 260	4.68	4.58	4.46	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 259	4.88	4.82	4.33	4.31	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	72/ 233	4.65	4.69	4.20	4.10	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103

Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB

Instructor: ZHU, LIANG

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 860 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

·					
St.udent.	('Ollred	F'772	luation	Ougeti	onn a i ra

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1 17	1056/1674	4 40	4 0 5	4.27	4.42	4.17
1 9 ,		-	•	1	0	3	2		1026/1674	4.42 4.63	4.05		4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0 2	0	1	0	1	3	4.17	262/1423	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.17 4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	J.	3	4.75	963/1609		4.16	4.27	4.34	4.75
·	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	2			4.57	3.60		4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	∠ 3	2	4.00	769/1585	4.25		3.96		4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	U T	3	2	4.17	767/1535 524/1651	4.01 4.58	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	-	0	0	0	0	0	3 6		1/1673			4.18		4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 1	0	0	0	2	1	2	5.00	955/1656	5.00 4.46	4.71 4.01	4.69	4.67	5.00 4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	2	Т	2	4.00	955/1656	4.40	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.68	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1225/1585	4.67	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	850/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1040/1575	4.43	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	666/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	3.75	3.68	4.01	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1		1024/1515	4.25	3.85	4.24	4.40	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1		1050/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.82	3.94	4.19	4.00
T albania banna														
Laboratory	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 265	4.78	4.61	4 22	4.53	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	Τ		****/ 278			4.23		****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 260	5.00 4.68	4.34	4.19	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0		-	-	1	•		,		4.58	4.46	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5 5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 259	4.88	4.82	4.33	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	****/ 233	4.65	4.69	4.20	4.10	* * * * *

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

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101

Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI

Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 861 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1480/1674	3.60	4.05	4.27	4.42	3.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1340/1674	3.80	4.14	4.23	4.31	3.80
4. Did o	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.00
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.00
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.00
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.60
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.20
9. How w	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.40
2. Did t	he instruc	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.40		
		explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	2		1272/1582	3.80	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.80		
		es contribute t		0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.00	
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques en	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.50	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.68	4.01	4.18	4.50
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.85	4.24	4.40	4.00
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.97	4.27	4.45	4.00
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****
		Labora	tory															
2. Were	you provid	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.21	****
		Semina	r															
2. Was t	he instruc	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.65	****
3. Did r	esearch pr	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.33	4.31	4.60	****
		Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credits	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
	00.07																	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ijors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0							,				1	TT7		_	37		^
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0						nera:	T				1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	0
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						ectiv	700				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	·h
Grau.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						ECCT	ves				U	respons					11
		F 0									respons	LD LU L	C DIGII	ııııcaı				

Other

4

Ι

0

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101 University of Maryland Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB Baltimore County

Instructor: TASCH, URI

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 10

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

1

Fall 2005
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 862 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did s	vou gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	Ο	5	5	4.50	607/1674	3.75	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	578/1674	4.25	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.50
		estions reflec		-	0	0	0	2	1	3	4		1107/1423	2.95	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.90
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	490/1609	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.50
				what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	1	1		1223/1585	2.75	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.50
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.40	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.80
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	673/1651	4.20	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.40
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.50	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00
				ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	381/1656	3.75	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	3.90	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.80
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.44	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.89
	s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	632/1582	4.25	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.50
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	819/1575	3.70	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.40
5. Did a	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	227/1380	3.81	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.63
		Discus	sion															
1. Did o	class discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****
3. Did t	the instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did t	the lab ind	rease understa	nding c	of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.61	4.23	4.53	5.00
				ground information	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	150/ 278	4.25	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.25
				for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	3		77/ 260	4.75	4.58	4.46	4.24	4.75
		structor provid			6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.31	5.00
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.10	4.50
	Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n												
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00_27								or Ma			0	Graduate		0	 Majo		0
	00-27					rec	4uil (=u I	OT INC	י זטני	>	U	Graduati	=	U	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	U
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Cer	nera	1				0	Under-gr	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gei	иста.	_				U	onder -g.	Luu 1	. 0	IVOII-	iia jui	U
01 130	_	3.00 3.19	_	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

10

F

Р

I

0

0

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102 University of Maryland Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB Baltimore County Instructor: TASCH, URI Fall 2005

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 863
Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Fall 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1628/1674	3.75	4.05	4.27	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.25	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1420/1423	2.95	4.16	4.27	4.34	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1572/1585	2.75	3.60	3.96	4.01	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.40	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.20	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.50	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.75	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.90	4.45	4.43	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.44	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.25	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	3.70	4.02	4.27	4.35	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.81	3.82	3.94	4.04	3.00
Even		Dia:	- m i b	.+	_									

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

Course-Section: ENME 489C 0101 University of Maryland Title MACROMECH OF COMPOSITE Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 Fall 2005

Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 30

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 864

Job IRBR3029

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	5	12	10	3	3.37	1555/1674	3.37	4.05	4.27	4.42	3.37
		ctor make clear			0	0	2	7	14	4	3	2.97	1618/1674	2.97	4.14	4.23	4.31	2.97
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	8	9	7	6	3.37	1309/1423	3.37	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.37
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	12	1	3	8	3	2	3.12	1548/1609	3.12	4.17	4.22	4.30	3.12
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	8	2	2	11	5	2	3.14	1411/1585	3.14	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.14
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	18	0	6	3	1	2	2.92	1466/1535	2.92	4.02	4.08	4.18	2.92
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	5	3	5	8	5	3	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.14	4.18	4.23	3.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	1	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	1196/1673	4.52	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.52
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	9	0	3	1	10	7	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	4	9	11	4	3.54	1474/1586	3.54	4.45	4.43	4.46	3.54
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	1	6	9	12	4.14	1441/1585	4.14	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.14
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	2	6	14	3	3	2.96	1514/1582	2.96	4.09	4.26	4.31	2.96
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	2	5	9	7	5	3.29	1437/1575	3.29	4.02	4.27	4.35	3.29
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	18	2	3	3	0	2	2.70	1300/1380	2.70	3.82	3.94	4.04	2.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	24	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	24	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		25	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Туј	pe			Majors	5			
00-27						Red	quir	ea i	or M	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	r	0
28-55						<i>a</i>		,			-	0	77 A		20	37		2
56-83						Gei	nera	T			1	4	Under-g	raa 2	28	Non-	major	3
	84-150 13 3.00-3.49 9 D 0					m ³						0	ииии ,		- la a - a -			-la
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F 0 P 0		ΕI	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1 respons				_][]
	I O					Ot1	her				1	5	-		3			

Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101 University of Maryland Page 865 Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006

Instructor: Mogavero, Marc

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1056/1674	4.17	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.02	4.08	4.18	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1146/1656	3.88	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	917/1585		4.42	4.69	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	379/1380	4.40	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	0						

Title ADV MECH ENGR DESIGN

Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 866 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	703/1674	4.44	4 05	4.27	4.44	4.44
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 7	4.44	248/1674		4.05	4.27	4.44	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	238/1423	4.78	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1609	4.78	4.17	4.22	4.34	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	295/1585	4.56	3.60	3.96	4.23	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	4.57	4.01	4.07	4.15	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586		4.45	4.43	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.42	4.69	4.79	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.88	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	359/1575		4.02	4.27	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1380	4.43	3.82	3.94	3.85	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	2		1092/1520		3.68	4.01	4.19	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	1		1024/1515	4.00	3.85	4.24	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	1		1050/1511	4.00	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	U	U	U	1	Τ	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	^ ^ ^ ^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.61	4.23	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.42	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 260	****	4.58	4.46	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	***	4.82	4.33	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.69	4.20	4.53	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 103	***	3.75	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8 8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 95 ****/ 99	****	4.33	4.31	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 97	****	5.00 4.80	4.39 4.14	4.54 4.26	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	0	U	U	U	U	U		5.00			4.00	4.14	4.20	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	***	5.00	4.45	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48 ****/ 49	****	5.00	4.12	4.35	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 49		4.83	4.27	4.46	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	4.46	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8 8	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 35 ****/ 31	****	5.00	4.36 4.34	4.84	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Ö	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.04	

Title ADV MECH ENGR DESIGN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 9

Baltimore County ANJANAPPA, MUNI Fall 2005

Page 866 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	d Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons				Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION

Title WOOD, WILLIAM

Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 867 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.05	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.34	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.17	4.22	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	395/1585	4.43	3.60	3.96	4.23	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.63	268/1535		4.02	4.08	4.27	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673		4.71			5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.01	4.07	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	3.85	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1027/1520	3.75	3.68	4.01	4.19	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1381/1515	3.25	3.85	4.24	4.47	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	896/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.61	4.23	4.51	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	259/ 278	3.00	4.34	4.19	4.42	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	****	4.58	4.46	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 259	****	4.82	4.33	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.69	4.20	4.53	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	102/ 103	2.50	3.75	4.41	4.56	2.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.93	4.48	4.62	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	0	0	1		89/ 95	3.00	4.33	4.31	4.43	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	60/ 76	3.00	4.00	3.98	4.20	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	46/ 77	3.67	4.33	3.93	4.31	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.64	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 48		5.00	4.12		5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/ 49	4.67	4.83	4.27	4.46	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 61	4.67	4.17	4.09	4.46	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52		4.67	4.26	4.59	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 50			4.44	4.64	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.84	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.64	5.00

Title SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION

Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 867 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006 ADV. COND. & RADIATION

Instructor: ZHU, LIANG

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 868

Job IRBR3029

	Questions					NA	Fro	_	ncies	3 4	E	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Questions			NK.	INA				- 1		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	735/1674	4.43	4.05	4.27	4.44	4.43
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	176/1674	4.86	4.14	4.23	4.34	4.86
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	404/1423	4.64	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.64
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1609	4.85	4.17	4.22	4.34	4.85
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	369/1585	4.45	3.60	3.96	4.23	4.45
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	116/1535	4.85	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.85
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	583/1651	4.46	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.46
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.71	4.69	4.78	4.86
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	437/1656	4.46	4.01	4.07	4.15	4.46
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instr	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.45	4.43	4.50	4.79		
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.79	5.00		
			xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	557/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.57	
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	2	0	5	7	4.21	992/1575	4.21	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.21
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	635/1380	4.08	3.82	3.94	3.85	4.08
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1116/1520	3.63	3.68	4.01	4.19	3.63
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1515	4.38	3.85	4.24	4.47	4.38
		_	_	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	896/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.25
		echniques succes			6	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	732/ 994			3.94		
				Frequ	ency	z Dis	trib	utio	n									
				1	2				-									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 9						quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	 e	8	Majo	r r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 4			-			J -						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_							_	_						

Other

11

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENME 664 0101 University of Maryland Page 869
Title DYNAMICS Baltimore County JAN 21, 2006
Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG Fall 2005
Enrollment: 23

G 1 1 1	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	naire

Questionnaires: 15

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	1296/1674	3.92	4.05	4.27	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	7	4	3.92	1246/1674	3.92	4.14	4.23	4.34	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	974/1423	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1484/1609	3.40	4.17	4.22	4.34	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	907/1585	3.91	3.60	3.96	4.23	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	832/1535	4.09	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.71	4.69	4.78	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1399/1656	3.45	4.01	4.07	4.15	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.45	4.43	4.50	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	9		1322/1585	4.38	4.42	4.69	4.79	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	3	5		1250/1582	3.85	4.09	4.26	4.33	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	975/1575	4.23	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	998/1380	3.60	3.82	3.94	3.85	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	5	Λ	3 30	1234/1520	3.38	3.68	4.01	4.19	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	2	4		1024/1515	4.00	3.85	4.24	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	3	3		1221/1511	3.75	3.97	4.27	4.49	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	****
1. Were special techniques successful	O	O	U	_	O	_	_	3.07	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		3.02	3.71	1.07	
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27 28-55	2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	. — А В	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	7	Major	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5	F P	0	Electives 2		#### - Means responses to	are not enough gnificant	L	
				I ?	0	Other	9				

Course-Section: ENME 813F 0101

MICRO FLUID MECHANICS

Title

Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2005

Page 870 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Tngt	tructor	Course Dept		TIMBC	Level	Sect		
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
<u> </u>			- 											
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3 67	1449/1674	3.67	4.05	4.27	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	2		1421/1674	3.67	4.14	4.23	4.34	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2		771/1423	4.33		4.27	4.28	4.33
		0	0	1	_	-	_							
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0				0	0			1094/1609	4.00	4.17	4.22	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.60	3.96	4.23	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.33		4.33		4.08	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0			768/1651	4.33		4.18	4.32	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0			1361/1673	4.33		4.69	4.78	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.01	4.07	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1442/1586	3.67	4.45	4.43	4.50	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1539/1585	3.67	4.42	4.69	4.79	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.09	4.26	4.33	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1329/1575	3.67	4.02	4.27	4.30	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	962/1380	3.67	3.82	3.94	3.85	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.68	4.01	4.19	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1253/1515	3.67	3.85	4.24	4.47	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	676/ 994	3.67	3.82	3.94	4.07	3.67
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.61	4.23	4.51	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.42	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 260	5.00		4.46	4.67	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 259	5.00		4.33	4.66	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.69	4.20	4.53	5.00
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified		U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	1/ 233	3.00	4.00	1.20	1.33	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	3.75	4.41	4.56	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.93	4.48	4.62	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 99	5.00	5.00		4.54	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.80		4.26	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	1	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/ 9/	5.00	4.00	4.14	4.20	5.00
Field Work														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4 00	2 00	4.20	5.00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned						0	3		,		4.00	3.98		
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 77	5.00	4.33	3.93	4.31	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.64	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.35	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.83	4.27	4.46	5.00
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	0	0	-	•	0	•	0	2 65	42/	2 65	4 15	4 00	4 46	2 65
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0		3.67	43/ 61		4.17		4.46	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.33	27/ 52	4.33	4.67		4.59	4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.64	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00		4.84	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.64	5.00

Course-Section: ENME 813F 0101

Title MICRO FLUID MECHANICS

Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 3

BENNETT, DAWN

Baltimore County Fall 2005 Page 870 JAN 21, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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