

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: GHARIB, AWAD A
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 735
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	11	13	4.38	698/1481	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	10	7	3.92	1094/1481	3.77	3.88	4.23	4.29	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	4	13	3	3.42	1132/1249	3.68	4.33	4.27	4.36	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	5	9	4	3.32	1318/1424	3.70	3.97	4.21	4.28	3.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	6	3	7	5	1	2.64	1355/1396	3.08	3.51	3.98	3.94	2.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	3	10	4	3	3.24	1212/1342	3.66	3.99	4.07	4.05	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	3	6	12	1	3.20	1348/1459	3.03	3.71	4.16	4.17	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	6	13	5	3.88	1422/1480	4.05	4.80	4.68	4.68	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	5	10	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.98	3.93	4.09	4.15	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	705/1409	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.47	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	842/1407	4.91	4.75	4.69	4.78	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	10	12	4.22	855/1399	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	10	12	4.26	867/1400	4.42	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	2	4	16	4.38	359/1179	4.30	3.82	3.96	4.05	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	944/1262	4.17	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	895/1259	4.02	4.42	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1052/1256	3.77	4.25	4.30	4.28	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	735/ 788	3.54	3.87	4.00	3.98	2.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	186/ 246	3.92	4.21	4.20	4.51	3.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	133/ 249	3.84	3.94	4.11	4.32	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	152/ 242	4.18	4.09	4.40	4.63	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	113/ 240	4.73	4.01	4.20	4.58	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	170/ 217	3.98	3.26	4.04	4.28	3.45	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 27	Non-major 7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 25		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: GHARIB, AWAD A
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 736
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	531/1481	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	6	0	3.18	1399/1481	3.77	3.88	4.23	4.29	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1134/1249	3.68	4.33	4.27	4.36	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1248/1424	3.70	3.97	4.21	4.28	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	6	1	3.00	1292/1396	3.08	3.51	3.98	3.94	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	5	0	4	6	3.73	999/1342	3.66	3.99	4.07	4.05	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	7	4	1	2.88	1407/1459	3.03	3.71	4.16	4.17	2.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	12	3	4.06	1336/1480	4.05	4.80	4.68	4.68	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	2	3.93	931/1450	3.98	3.93	4.09	4.15	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	500/1409	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	4.91	4.75	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	901/1399	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	692/1400	4.42	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	541/1179	4.30	3.82	3.96	4.05	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	684/1262	4.17	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1007/1259	4.02	4.42	4.29	4.34	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	1038/1256	3.77	4.25	4.30	4.28	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	335/ 788	3.54	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 246	3.92	4.21	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 249	3.84	3.94	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 242	4.18	4.09	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 240	4.73	4.01	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 217	3.98	3.26	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 204 0103
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: GHARIB, AWAD A
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 737
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1481	4.57	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	884/1481	3.77	3.88	4.23	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	788/1249	3.68	4.33	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	807/1424	3.70	3.97	4.21	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1025/1396	3.08	3.51	3.98	3.94	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	755/1342	3.66	3.99	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.03	3.71	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1260/1480	4.05	4.80	4.68	4.68	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	334/1450	3.98	3.93	4.09	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	4.91	4.75	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1400	4.42	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	340/1179	4.30	3.82	3.96	4.05	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.17	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	821/1259	4.02	4.42	4.29	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1025/1256	3.77	4.25	4.30	4.28	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	584/ 788	3.54	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	155/ 246	3.92	4.21	4.20	4.51	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	196/ 249	3.84	3.94	4.11	4.32	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	184/ 242	4.18	4.09	4.40	4.63	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	4.73	4.01	4.20	4.58	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	66/ 217	3.98	3.26	4.04	4.28	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 217 0101
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 738
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1018/1481	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1000/1481	4.23	3.88	4.23	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	611/1249	4.47	4.33	4.27	4.36	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	773/1424	4.18	3.97	4.21	4.28	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	380/1396	4.15	3.51	3.98	3.94	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	474/1342	4.38	3.99	4.07	4.05	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	961/1459	4.37	3.71	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.80	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1249/1450	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.15	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	290/1409	4.80	4.35	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1086/1399	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.29	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1230/1400	3.95	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1005/1179	3.52	3.82	3.96	4.05	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	6	1	3.36	1048/1262	3.54	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	480/1259	4.44	4.42	4.29	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1025/1256	3.93	4.25	4.30	4.28	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	590/ 788	4.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 217 0102
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 739
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	1	7	4.00	1069/1481	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	975/1481	4.23	3.88	4.23	4.29	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	832/1249	4.47	4.33	4.27	4.36	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1152/1424	4.18	3.97	4.21	4.28	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	1	3	3.55	1059/1396	4.15	3.51	3.98	3.94	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	683/1342	4.38	3.99	4.07	4.05	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	460/1459	4.37	3.71	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	770/1480	4.95	4.80	4.68	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	1223/1450	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.15	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	588/1409	4.80	4.35	4.42	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	986/1407	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.78	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1152/1399	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.29	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	4	0	6	3.67	1183/1400	3.95	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	894/1179	3.52	3.82	3.96	4.05	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1018/1262	3.54	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	987/1259	4.44	4.42	4.29	4.34	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1069/1256	3.93	4.25	4.30	4.28	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	176/ 788	4.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	698/1481	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.40	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	386/1481	4.23	3.88	4.23	4.29	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1249	4.47	4.33	4.27	4.36	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	437/1424	4.18	3.97	4.21	4.28	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	297/1396	4.15	3.51	3.98	3.94	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	166/1342	4.38	3.99	4.07	4.05	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	332/1459	4.37	3.71	4.16	4.17	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.80	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	702/1450	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.15	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	150/1409	4.80	4.35	4.42	4.47	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	804/1407	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	703/1399	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	385/1400	3.95	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	4	0	6	3.83	739/1179	3.52	3.82	3.96	4.05	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	862/1262	3.54	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	304/1259	4.44	4.42	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	723/1256	3.93	4.25	4.30	4.28	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	133/ 788	4.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.20	4.58	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 741
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	14	9	3.91	1162/1481	3.91	4.23	4.29	4.29	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	8	9	7	6	3.22	1392/1481	3.22	3.88	4.23	4.23	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	9	7	8	3.34	1146/1249	3.34	4.33	4.27	4.28	3.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	4	9	7	8	3.68	1221/1424	3.68	3.97	4.21	4.27	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	3	6	7	4	3.17	1239/1396	3.17	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	5	5	3	7	5	3.08	1258/1342	3.08	3.99	4.07	4.12	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	6	5	8	5	6	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	3.71	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.80	4.68	4.65	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	4	7	8	5	3.58	1195/1450	3.58	3.93	4.09	4.10	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	11	9	8	3.59	1282/1409	3.59	4.35	4.42	4.43	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	5	22	4.47	1137/1407	4.47	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	11	10	4	3.32	1280/1399	3.32	4.00	4.26	4.27	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	7	12	7	3.58	1209/1400	3.58	4.04	4.27	4.28	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	1	3	1	5	2	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.82	3.96	4.02	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.09	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	3.26	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 741
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101
 Title FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 742
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	8	5	2	3.16	1434/1481	3.16	4.23	4.29	4.29	3.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	3	6	3	2	2.68	1462/1481	2.68	3.88	4.23	4.23	2.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	5	3	6	0	2.61	1228/1249	2.61	4.33	4.27	4.28	2.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	4	2	7	2	3.06	1357/1424	3.06	3.97	4.21	4.27	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	5	4	3.25	1199/1396	3.25	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	6	3	3	2.94	1289/1342	2.94	3.99	4.07	4.12	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	4	3	7	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	3.71	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	729/1480	4.89	4.80	4.68	4.65	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	5	3	1	1	2.38	1434/1450	2.38	3.93	4.09	4.10	2.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	5	3	6	2	3.06	1354/1409	3.06	4.35	4.42	4.43	3.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	3	5	2	6	3.53	1370/1407	3.53	4.75	4.69	4.67	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	4	5	3	1	2.69	1370/1399	2.69	4.00	4.26	4.27	2.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	2	4	4	2	2.67	1354/1400	2.67	4.04	4.27	4.28	2.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	5	3	5	4	0	2.47	1131/1179	2.47	3.82	3.96	4.02	2.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.86	4.05	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1149/1259	3.20	4.42	4.29	4.34	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1084/1256	3.60	4.25	4.30	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101
 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES
 Instructor: DOSS, DAVID J
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 743
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	13	7	3.83	1206/1481	3.83	4.23	4.29	4.29	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	11	14	4.23	843/1481	4.23	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	586/1249	4.43	4.33	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	****/1424	****	3.97	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	0	5	3	4	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/1342	****	3.99	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	12	14	4.33	695/1459	4.33	3.71	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	20	4	3.93	1398/1480	3.93	4.80	4.68	4.65	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	13	7	7	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	3.93	4.09	4.10	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	13	13	4.27	1025/1409	4.27	4.35	4.42	4.43	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	930/1407	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	8	11	7	3.60	1217/1399	3.60	4.00	4.26	4.27	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	7	7	3	10	3.33	1269/1400	3.33	4.04	4.27	4.28	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	4	3	6	11	3.77	786/1179	3.77	3.82	3.96	4.02	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 10	C 8	General	0
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 744
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	428/1481	4.41	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	469/1481	4.31	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	395/1424	4.34	3.97	4.21	4.27	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1181/1396	3.50	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	214/1342	4.47	3.99	4.07	4.12	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	757/1459	3.95	3.71	4.16	4.17	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	217/1450	4.29	3.93	4.09	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	319/1409	4.59	4.35	4.42	4.43	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	625/1399	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1400	4.61	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	299/1179	4.53	3.82	3.96	4.02	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.58	4.21	4.20	4.20	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	69/ 249	4.51	3.94	4.11	4.23	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	180/ 242	4.12	4.09	4.40	4.36	4.11	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	115/ 240	4.34	4.01	4.20	3.96	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	61/ 217	3.94	3.26	4.04	4.11	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.88	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 744
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 745
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	362/1481	4.41	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	286/1481	4.31	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	178/1424	4.34	3.97	4.21	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1218/1396	3.50	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	364/1342	4.47	3.99	4.07	4.12	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1125/1459	3.95	3.71	4.16	4.17	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	334/1450	4.29	3.93	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.59	4.35	4.42	4.43	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	421/1400	4.61	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	177/1179	4.53	3.82	3.96	4.02	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.34	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	57/ 246	4.58	4.21	4.20	4.20	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	114/ 249	4.51	3.94	4.11	4.23	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	84/ 242	4.12	4.09	4.40	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	137/ 240	4.34	4.01	4.20	3.96	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	94/ 217	3.94	3.26	4.04	4.11	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 746
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	967/1481	4.41	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.31	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.28	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	959/1424	4.34	3.97	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	918/1396	3.50	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	405/1342	4.47	3.99	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1086/1459	3.95	3.71	4.16	4.17	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	836/1450	4.29	3.93	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	968/1409	4.59	4.35	4.42	4.43	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	883/1399	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	704/1400	4.61	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	259/1179	4.53	3.82	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	94/ 246	4.58	4.21	4.20	4.20	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	66/ 249	4.51	3.94	4.11	4.23	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	210/ 242	4.12	4.09	4.40	4.36	3.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	144/ 240	4.34	4.01	4.20	3.96	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	173/ 217	3.94	3.26	4.04	4.11	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 747
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	967/1481	4.41	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.31	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	959/1424	4.34	3.97	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	918/1396	3.50	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	405/1342	4.47	3.99	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1086/1459	3.95	3.71	4.16	4.17	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	836/1450	4.29	3.93	4.09	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	762/1409	4.59	4.35	4.42	4.43	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.61	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	259/1179	4.53	3.82	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	94/ 246	4.58	4.21	4.20	4.20	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	66/ 249	4.51	3.94	4.11	4.23	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	210/ 242	4.12	4.09	4.40	4.36	3.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	144/ 240	4.34	4.01	4.20	3.96	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	173/ 217	3.94	3.26	4.04	4.11	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 360 0101
 Title VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: DAHAGHIN, HOMAY
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 748
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	6	18	18	4.18	928/1481	4.18	4.23	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	12	21	4.16	917/1481	4.16	3.88	4.23	4.23	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	13	26	4.48	535/1249	4.48	4.33	4.27	4.28	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	874/1424	4.14	3.97	4.21	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	2	2	11	8	5	3.43	1125/1396	3.43	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	2	1	3	12	7	3.84	927/1342	3.84	3.99	4.07	4.12	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	5	22	12	4.02	950/1459	4.02	3.71	4.16	4.17	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	43	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	10	16	6	3.88	997/1450	3.88	3.93	4.09	4.10	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	12	30	4.59	659/1409	4.59	4.35	4.42	4.43	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	10	31	4.64	997/1407	4.64	4.75	4.69	4.67	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	15	21	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	11	26	4.45	647/1400	4.45	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	36	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	****/1179	****	3.82	3.96	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	37	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.20	3.96	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ENME 360 0101
 Title VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: DAHAGHIN, HOMAY
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 748
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	9	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	11
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	40				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 749
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1424	4.50	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	985/1396	3.67	3.51	3.98	4.09	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	592/1342	4.20	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	872/1459	4.14	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450	4.86	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1400	4.86	4.04	4.27	4.38	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	323/1179	4.43	3.82	3.96	4.07	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 412 0101
 Title MECH DESIGN:MANUF/PROD
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 750
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	256/1481	4.79	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1094/1481	3.93	3.88	4.23	4.32	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	865/1249	4.07	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	437/1424	4.50	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	403/1396	4.38	3.51	3.98	4.09	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	707/1342	4.08	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	924/1459	4.07	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	966/1480	4.64	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	334/1450	4.50	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	659/1399	4.43	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.04	4.27	4.38	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	426/1179	4.27	3.82	3.96	4.07	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.78	4.21	4.20	4.45	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	53/ 249	4.67	3.94	4.11	3.87	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	58/ 242	4.78	4.09	4.40	4.45	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	39/ 240	4.89	4.01	4.20	4.43	4.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	49/ 217	4.67	3.26	4.04	3.86	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 423 0101
 Title HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN
 Instructor: FISHER, JESSE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 751
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	736/1481	4.33	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	354/1424	4.58	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	869/1396	3.82	3.51	3.98	4.09	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	474/1342	4.33	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	367/1459	4.58	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1329/1480	4.08	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	609/1450	4.27	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.04	4.27	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	510/1179	4.17	3.82	3.96	4.07	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 752
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1006/1481	4.25	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	959/1481	4.05	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	807/1424	4.30	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	707/1396	4.00	3.51	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	474/1342	4.42	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	800/1459	3.81	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	836/1450	4.25	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	891/1409	4.70	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1107/1407	4.55	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	1002/1399	4.30	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	985/1400	3.85	4.04	4.27	4.38	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	442/1179	4.03	3.82	3.96	4.07	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.60	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	74/ 246	4.58	4.21	4.20	4.45	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	114/ 249	4.42	3.94	4.11	3.87	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	170/ 242	4.49	4.09	4.40	4.45	4.22	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	137/ 240	4.42	4.01	4.20	4.43	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	110/ 217	3.99	3.26	4.04	3.86	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 752
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 753
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	678/1481	4.25	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1000/1481	4.05	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	557/1424	4.30	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	4.00	3.51	3.98	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.42	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1297/1459	3.81	3.71	4.16	4.25	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.25	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	4.70	4.35	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1031/1407	4.55	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.30	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1204/1400	3.85	4.04	4.27	4.38	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	760/1179	4.03	3.82	3.96	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.60	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	57/ 246	4.58	4.21	4.20	4.45	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	76/ 249	4.42	3.94	4.11	3.87	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 242	4.49	4.09	4.40	4.45	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	103/ 240	4.42	4.01	4.20	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	152/ 217	3.99	3.26	4.04	3.86	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 754
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1407/1481	3.33	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	740/1424	4.25	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1396	****	3.51	3.98	4.09	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	1	5	3.82	948/1342	3.82	3.99	4.07	4.21	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	3	4	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	3.71	4.16	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1314/1450	3.22	3.93	4.09	4.28	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	935/1409	4.36	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	880/1407	4.73	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	1	1	5	3.55	1219/1400	3.55	4.04	4.27	4.38	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.82	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.87	4.00	4.26	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 246	****	4.21	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.50	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.09	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.26	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 754
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 755
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1218/1481	3.91	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	4	5	3.88	1136/1481	4.10	3.88	4.23	4.32	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	679/1249	4.23	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	671/1424	4.38	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	839/1396	3.68	3.51	3.98	4.09	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	660/1342	4.29	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	565/1459	4.50	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.96	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	732/1450	3.95	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	946/1409	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	1245/1407	4.42	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	976/1399	3.92	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1074/1400	3.85	4.04	4.27	4.38	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	894/1179	3.83	3.82	3.96	4.07	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.60	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	104/ 246	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.45	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	61/ 249	4.45	3.94	4.11	3.87	4.62	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	108/ 242	4.34	4.09	4.40	4.45	4.54	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	121/ 240	4.49	4.01	4.20	4.43	4.42	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	126/ 217	4.40	3.26	4.04	3.86	4.08	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 755
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 756
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1069/1481	3.91	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	736/1481	4.10	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	839/1249	4.23	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	509/1424	4.38	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1083/1396	3.68	3.51	3.98	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	364/1342	4.29	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1459	4.50	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.95	3.93	4.09	4.28	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	839/1409	4.40	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1069/1407	4.42	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1156/1399	3.92	4.00	4.26	4.36	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1135/1400	3.85	4.04	4.27	4.38	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	510/1179	3.83	3.82	3.96	4.07	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1262	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.42	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	****	4.25	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	94/ 246	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.45	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	122/ 249	4.45	3.94	4.11	3.87	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	177/ 242	4.34	4.09	4.40	4.45	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	94/ 240	4.49	4.01	4.20	4.43	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 217	4.40	3.26	4.04	3.86	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 489G 0101
 Title BIOMATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 757
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	957/1481	4.15	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1106/1481	3.92	3.88	4.23	4.32	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	470/1249	4.54	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	852/1424	4.15	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	169/1396	4.69	3.51	3.98	4.09	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	504/1342	4.31	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	792/1459	4.23	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	989/1480	4.62	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	334/1450	4.50	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1092/1409	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	613/1399	4.46	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	561/1400	4.54	4.04	4.27	4.38	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	753/1179	3.82	3.82	3.96	4.07	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.42	4.29	4.57	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.25	4.30	4.60	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.87	4.00	4.26	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.21	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.09	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.26	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 489G 0101
 Title BIOMATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 757
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489H 0101
 Title HEAT TRAN BIOLOGICAL S
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 758
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	287/1424	4.67	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	985/1396	3.67	3.51	3.98	4.09	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	3.99	4.07	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.71	4.16	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	3.93	4.09	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.35	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.04	4.27	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.82	3.96	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	995/1262	3.50	3.86	4.05	4.33	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.42	4.29	4.57	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.25	4.30	4.60	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 489J 0101
 Title MATERIALS AND PROC MEM
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 759
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.23	4.29	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	884/1481	4.20	3.88	4.23	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	996/1249	3.87	4.33	4.27	4.44	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	874/1424	4.13	3.97	4.21	4.35	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	5	2	1	2.75	1345/1396	2.75	3.51	3.98	4.09	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	858/1342	3.92	3.99	4.07	4.21	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	8	5	4.07	929/1459	4.07	3.71	4.16	4.25	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	491/1480	4.93	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	311/1450	4.54	3.93	4.09	4.28	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	246/1409	4.87	4.35	4.42	4.51	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	683/1399	4.40	4.00	4.26	4.36	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.04	4.27	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	291/1179	4.47	3.82	3.96	4.07	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	887/1262	3.75	3.86	4.05	4.33	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.42	4.29	4.57	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.60	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.21	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.09	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 217	****	3.26	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 489J 0101
 Title MATERIALS AND PROC MEM
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 759
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489S 0101
 Title SPACE TECH & DESIGN
 Instructor: Mogavero, Marc
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 760
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	7	2	3.43	1380/1481	3.43	4.23	4.29	4.45	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	1	4	3.57	1296/1481	3.57	3.88	4.23	4.32	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	962/1249	3.93	4.33	4.27	4.44	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	3	3.57	1251/1424	3.57	3.97	4.21	4.35	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	4	4	4	1	3.15	1245/1396	3.15	3.51	3.98	4.09	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	5	1	3.36	1180/1342	3.36	3.99	4.07	4.21	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	3.43	1288/1459	3.43	3.71	4.16	4.25	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	7	6	0	3.29	1299/1450	3.29	3.93	4.09	4.28	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1243/1409	3.79	4.35	4.42	4.51	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	899/1407	4.71	4.75	4.69	4.79	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1178/1399	3.71	4.00	4.26	4.36	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1211/1400	3.57	4.04	4.27	4.38	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	793/1179	3.75	3.82	3.96	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1146/1262	3.00	3.86	4.05	4.33	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.25	4.30	4.60	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 605 0101
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 761
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	183/1481	4.80	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1249	4.80	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1424	5.00	3.97	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	241/1396	4.60	3.51	3.98	4.00	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	238/1342	4.60	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.71	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450	4.33	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.35	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.82	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.80	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.87	4.00	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 640 0101
 Title FUND FLUID MECH I
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 762
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	818/1481	4.27	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	704/1481	4.36	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	561/1249	4.45	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	896/1424	4.11	3.97	4.21	4.16	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1272/1396	3.10	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	592/1342	4.20	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	101/1459	4.90	3.71	4.16	4.01	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	997/1480	4.60	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	771/1450	4.11	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	319/1409	4.82	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	625/1399	4.45	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/1400	4.40	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	1120/1179	2.63	3.82	3.96	3.81	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	5	0	3.33	1059/1262	3.33	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1079/1256	3.63	4.25	4.30	4.33	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	777/ 788	2.25	3.87	4.00	3.97	2.25	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.44	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 5
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Major 0
				P 0	Non-major 3
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 11
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 662 0101
 Title LINEAR VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 763
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1424	5.00	3.97	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	136/1396	4.75	3.51	3.98	4.00	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.99	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	131/1459	4.86	3.71	4.16	4.01	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	912/1480	4.71	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	184/1450	4.71	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.35	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.82	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.21	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.09	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.01	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.26	4.04	3.73	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 662 0101
 Title LINEAR VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 763
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 677 0101
 Title APPLIED ELASTICITY
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 764
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	884/1481	4.20	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	959/1424	4.00	3.97	4.21	4.16	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	816/1396	3.89	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	987/1342	3.75	3.99	4.07	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1228/1459	3.60	3.71	4.16	4.01	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1260/1480	4.20	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	445/1450	4.43	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	1122/1409	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1031/1407	4.60	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1096/1399	3.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	913/1400	4.20	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	997/1179	3.25	3.82	3.96	3.81	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 2 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 678 0101
 Title FRACTURE MECHANICS
 Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 765
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	975/1481	4.07	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	1	1	9	4.14	863/1424	4.14	3.97	4.21	4.16	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	1	1	4	3.18	1228/1396	3.18	3.51	3.98	4.00	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	603/1342	4.18	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	695/1459	4.33	3.71	4.16	4.01	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	896/1480	4.73	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	836/1450	4.00	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	997/1400	4.07	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	472/1179	4.21	3.82	3.96	3.81	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	320/1262	4.56	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	229/1259	4.89	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.87	4.00	3.97	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 680 0101
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL MECHANICS
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 766
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	135/1481	4.88	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	381/1249	4.63	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1424	4.75	3.97	4.21	4.16	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.51	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1459	4.83	3.71	4.16	4.01	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450	4.86	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.35	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1399	4.88	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1400	4.88	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	223/1179	4.57	3.82	3.96	3.81	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/ 246	4.86	4.21	4.20	4.27	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 249	4.86	3.94	4.11	3.93	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	46/ 242	4.86	4.09	4.40	4.27	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	44/ 240	4.86	4.01	4.20	4.15	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/ 217	4.86	3.26	4.04	3.73	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0101
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 767
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1374/1481	3.76	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1468/1481	2.24	3.88	4.23	4.11	2.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1249	****	4.33	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1387/1424	2.61	3.97	4.21	4.16	2.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	1363/1396	2.35	3.51	3.98	4.00	2.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	1307/1342	3.06	3.99	4.07	4.18	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	1	2	0	0	1.56	1449/1459	1.47	3.71	4.16	4.01	1.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1406/1450	2.95	3.93	4.09	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1317/1409	3.40	4.35	4.42	4.36	3.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1008/1407	4.66	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1325/1399	2.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1283/1400	2.91	4.04	4.27	4.17	2.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	894/1179	2.88	3.82	3.96	3.81	2.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	0	3	3.11	1129/1262	3.39	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	0	4	3.44	1113/1259	4.22	4.42	4.29	4.30	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	2	1	2	3.00	1167/1256	3.57	4.25	4.30	4.33	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	577/ 788	3.95	3.87	4.00	3.97	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	226/ 246	3.71	4.21	4.20	4.27	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.94	4.11	3.93	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	184/ 242	3.57	4.09	4.40	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	207/ 240	3.00	4.01	4.20	4.15	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	215/ 217	1.57	3.26	4.04	3.73	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	66/ 68	2.64	2.64	4.49	4.23	2.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	66/ 69	3.86	3.86	4.53	4.46	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	56/ 63	3.86	3.86	4.44	4.44	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	66/ 69	3.14	3.25	4.35	4.16	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	65/ 68	1.25	1.47	3.92	3.71	1.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	51/ 59	3.14	3.25	4.30	4.01	3.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	50/ 51	1.67	2.25	4.00	3.81	1.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	3.50	3.80	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	53/ 55	2.67	3.00	4.55	4.38	2.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	51/ 51	2.33	3.00	4.65	4.54	2.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0101
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 767
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0101
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 768
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1374/1481	3.76	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1468/1481	2.24	3.88	4.23	4.11	2.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1249	****	4.33	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1387/1424	2.61	3.97	4.21	4.16	2.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	1363/1396	2.35	3.51	3.98	4.00	2.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	1307/1342	3.06	3.99	4.07	4.18	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	1	2	0	0	1.56	1449/1459	1.47	3.71	4.16	4.01	1.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1354/1450	2.95	3.93	4.09	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1338/1409	3.40	4.35	4.42	4.36	3.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1107/1407	4.66	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1325/1399	2.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	1376/1400	2.91	4.04	4.27	4.17	2.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.88	3.82	3.96	3.81	2.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	0	3	3.11	1129/1262	3.39	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	0	4	3.44	1113/1259	4.22	4.42	4.29	4.30	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	2	1	2	3.00	1167/1256	3.57	4.25	4.30	4.33	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	577/ 788	3.95	3.87	4.00	3.97	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	226/ 246	3.71	4.21	4.20	4.27	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.94	4.11	3.93	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	184/ 242	3.57	4.09	4.40	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	207/ 240	3.00	4.01	4.20	4.15	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	215/ 217	1.57	3.26	4.04	3.73	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	66/ 68	2.64	2.64	4.49	4.23	2.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	66/ 69	3.86	3.86	4.53	4.46	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	56/ 63	3.86	3.86	4.44	4.44	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	66/ 69	3.14	3.25	4.35	4.16	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	65/ 68	1.25	1.47	3.92	3.71	1.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	51/ 59	3.14	3.25	4.30	4.01	3.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	50/ 51	1.67	2.25	4.00	3.81	1.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	3.50	3.80	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	53/ 55	2.67	3.00	4.55	4.38	2.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	51/ 51	2.33	3.00	4.65	4.54	2.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0101
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 768
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0101
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 769
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1374/1481	3.76	4.23	4.29	4.28	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1468/1481	2.24	3.88	4.23	4.11	2.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1249	****	4.33	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1387/1424	2.61	3.97	4.21	4.16	2.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	1363/1396	2.35	3.51	3.98	4.00	2.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	1307/1342	3.06	3.99	4.07	4.18	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	1	2	0	0	1.56	1449/1459	1.47	3.71	4.16	4.01	1.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1307/1450	2.95	3.93	4.09	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1356/1409	3.40	4.35	4.42	4.36	3.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1107/1407	4.66	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1294/1399	2.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1364/1400	2.91	4.04	4.27	4.17	2.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1114/1179	2.88	3.82	3.96	3.81	2.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	0	3	3.11	1129/1262	3.39	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	0	4	3.44	1113/1259	4.22	4.42	4.29	4.30	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	3	2	1	2	3.00	1167/1256	3.57	4.25	4.30	4.33	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	577/ 788	3.95	3.87	4.00	3.97	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	226/ 246	3.71	4.21	4.20	4.27	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.94	4.11	3.93	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	184/ 242	3.57	4.09	4.40	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	207/ 240	3.00	4.01	4.20	4.15	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	215/ 217	1.57	3.26	4.04	3.73	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	66/ 68	2.64	2.64	4.49	4.23	2.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	66/ 69	3.86	3.86	4.53	4.46	3.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	56/ 63	3.86	3.86	4.44	4.44	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	66/ 69	3.14	3.25	4.35	4.16	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	65/ 68	1.25	1.47	3.92	3.71	1.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	51/ 59	3.14	3.25	4.30	4.01	3.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	50/ 51	1.67	2.25	4.00	3.81	1.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	3.50	3.80	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	53/ 55	2.67	3.00	4.55	4.38	2.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	51/ 51	2.33	3.00	4.65	4.54	2.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0101
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 769
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 770
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1069/1481	3.76	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1476/1481	2.24	3.88	4.23	4.11	2.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1418/1424	2.61	3.97	4.21	4.16	2.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1384/1396	2.35	3.51	3.98	4.00	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1220/1342	3.06	3.99	4.07	4.18	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1452/1459	1.47	3.71	4.16	4.01	1.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1437/1450	2.95	3.93	4.09	3.96	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1152/1409	3.40	4.35	4.42	4.36	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	4.66	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1363/1399	2.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1283/1400	2.91	4.04	4.27	4.17	3.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1041/1179	2.88	3.82	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	958/1262	3.39	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.22	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	3.57	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	318/ 788	3.95	3.87	4.00	3.97	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	155/ 246	3.71	4.21	4.20	4.27	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.94	4.11	3.93	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	236/ 242	3.57	4.09	4.40	4.27	3.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	225/ 240	3.00	4.01	4.20	4.15	2.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	210/ 217	1.57	3.26	4.04	3.73	2.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	64/ 68	2.64	2.64	4.49	4.23	2.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	3.86	3.86	4.53	4.46	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	45/ 63	3.86	3.86	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	62/ 69	3.14	3.25	4.35	4.16	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	65/ 68	1.25	1.47	3.92	3.71	1.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	53/ 59	3.14	3.25	4.30	4.01	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	1.67	2.25	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	30/ 41	3.50	3.80	4.26	4.27	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	2.67	3.00	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	2.33	3.00	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 770
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 771
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1069/1481	3.76	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1476/1481	2.24	3.88	4.23	4.11	2.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1418/1424	2.61	3.97	4.21	4.16	2.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1384/1396	2.35	3.51	3.98	4.00	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1220/1342	3.06	3.99	4.07	4.18	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1452/1459	1.47	3.71	4.16	4.01	1.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1354/1450	2.95	3.93	4.09	3.96	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1325/1409	3.40	4.35	4.42	4.36	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	963/1407	4.66	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1392/1399	2.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1312/1400	2.91	4.04	4.27	4.17	3.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1041/1179	2.88	3.82	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	958/1262	3.39	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.22	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	3.57	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	318/ 788	3.95	3.87	4.00	3.97	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	155/ 246	3.71	4.21	4.20	4.27	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.94	4.11	3.93	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	236/ 242	3.57	4.09	4.40	4.27	3.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	225/ 240	3.00	4.01	4.20	4.15	2.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	210/ 217	1.57	3.26	4.04	3.73	2.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	64/ 68	2.64	2.64	4.49	4.23	2.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	3.86	3.86	4.53	4.46	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	45/ 63	3.86	3.86	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	62/ 69	3.14	3.25	4.35	4.16	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	65/ 68	1.25	1.47	3.92	3.71	1.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	53/ 59	3.14	3.25	4.30	4.01	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	1.67	2.25	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	30/ 41	3.50	3.80	4.26	4.27	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	2.67	3.00	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	2.33	3.00	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 771
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 772
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1069/1481	3.76	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1476/1481	2.24	3.88	4.23	4.11	2.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1418/1424	2.61	3.97	4.21	4.16	2.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1384/1396	2.35	3.51	3.98	4.00	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1220/1342	3.06	3.99	4.07	4.18	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1452/1459	1.47	3.71	4.16	4.01	1.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1285/1450	2.95	3.93	4.09	3.96	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1325/1409	3.40	4.35	4.42	4.36	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1221/1407	4.66	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1325/1399	2.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1312/1400	2.91	4.04	4.27	4.17	3.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1041/1179	2.88	3.82	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	958/1262	3.39	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.22	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	3.57	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	318/ 788	3.95	3.87	4.00	3.97	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	155/ 246	3.71	4.21	4.20	4.27	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.94	4.11	3.93	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	236/ 242	3.57	4.09	4.40	4.27	3.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	225/ 240	3.00	4.01	4.20	4.15	2.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	210/ 217	1.57	3.26	4.04	3.73	2.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	64/ 68	2.64	2.64	4.49	4.23	2.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	3.86	3.86	4.53	4.46	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	45/ 63	3.86	3.86	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	62/ 69	3.14	3.25	4.35	4.16	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	65/ 68	1.25	1.47	3.92	3.71	1.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	53/ 59	3.14	3.25	4.30	4.01	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	1.67	2.25	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	30/ 41	3.50	3.80	4.26	4.27	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	2.67	3.00	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	2.33	3.00	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 772
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 773
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1069/1481	3.76	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1476/1481	2.24	3.88	4.23	4.11	2.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1418/1424	2.61	3.97	4.21	4.16	2.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1384/1396	2.35	3.51	3.98	4.00	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1220/1342	3.06	3.99	4.07	4.18	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1.40	1452/1459	1.47	3.71	4.16	4.01	1.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1354/1450	2.95	3.93	4.09	3.96	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1293/1409	3.40	4.35	4.42	4.36	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.66	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1325/1399	2.90	4.00	4.26	4.16	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1312/1400	2.91	4.04	4.27	4.17	3.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1041/1179	2.88	3.82	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	958/1262	3.39	3.86	4.05	4.07	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.22	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	3.57	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	318/ 788	3.95	3.87	4.00	3.97	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	155/ 246	3.71	4.21	4.20	4.27	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.94	4.11	3.93	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	236/ 242	3.57	4.09	4.40	4.27	3.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	225/ 240	3.00	4.01	4.20	4.15	2.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	210/ 217	1.57	3.26	4.04	3.73	2.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	64/ 68	2.64	2.64	4.49	4.23	2.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 69	3.86	3.86	4.53	4.46	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	45/ 63	3.86	3.86	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	62/ 69	3.14	3.25	4.35	4.16	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	65/ 68	1.25	1.47	3.92	3.71	1.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	53/ 59	3.14	3.25	4.30	4.01	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	1.67	2.25	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	30/ 41	3.50	3.80	4.26	4.27	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	2.67	3.00	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	2.33	3.00	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 808R 0201
 Title DESIGN, ENGR, TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 773
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 813H 0101
 Title HEAT TRANS BIOL SYSTEM
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 774
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1481	4.67	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1424	5.00	3.97	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	554/1396	4.20	3.51	3.98	4.00	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.71	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1450	4.80	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	111/1179	4.80	3.82	3.96	3.81	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	205/1262	4.75	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.87	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	3.94	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	2.64	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.86	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	3.86	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	3.25	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	1.47	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.25	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	2.25	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.80	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.00	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENME 813H 0101
 Title HEAT TRANS BIOL SYSTEM
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 774
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 815W 0101
 Title WAVE PROPAGATION
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 775
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	3.97	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.51	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.67	3.71	4.16	4.01	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.67	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.25	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.82	3.96	3.81	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.87	4.00	3.97	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 815W 0101
 Title WAVE PROPAGATION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 776
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1481	4.67	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	3.97	4.21	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	435/1396	4.33	3.51	3.98	4.00	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1459	4.67	3.71	4.16	4.01	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.25	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.42	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.25	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.87	4.00	3.97	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 816T 0101
 Title MULTI TRANS PHENOMENA
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 777
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.23	4.29	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	3.88	4.23	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	740/1424	4.25	3.97	4.21	4.16	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.51	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1342	4.75	3.99	4.07	4.18	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1459	4.75	3.71	4.16	4.01	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.80	4.68	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	630/1450	4.25	3.93	4.09	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.00	4.26	4.16	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.75	4.04	4.27	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.82	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.86	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.25	4.30	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.87	4.00	3.97	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	74/ 246	4.50	4.21	4.20	4.27	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	40/ 249	4.75	3.94	4.11	3.93	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 242	4.75	4.09	4.40	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	64/ 240	4.75	4.01	4.20	4.15	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	106/ 217	4.25	3.26	4.04	3.73	4.25	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	48/ 69	4.00	3.25	4.35	4.16	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	57/ 68	3.00	1.47	3.92	3.71	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 59	4.00	3.25	4.30	4.01	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 51	4.00	2.25	4.00	3.81	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.65	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	3.80	4.26	4.27	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	44/ 55	4.00	3.00	4.55	4.38	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.95	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 51	5.00	3.00	4.65	4.54	5.00	

Course-Section: ENME 816T 0101
 Title MULTI TRANS PHENOMENA
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 777
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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