Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 110 02			Term - Fall 2010						Enrollment:	8
Title:	Statics									Questionnaires:	1
Instructor:	Farquhar,Anthon										

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.60	3.98	4.31	4.16	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1527	4.44	3.82	4.28	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1333	4.46	3.85	4.34	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1495	4.36	3.86	4.25	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1439	4.19	3.60	4.11	3.97	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1508	4.19	3.76	4.18	4.11	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.57	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1202/1428	3.75	4.08	4.49	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.90	4.41	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1080/1427	3.89	3.74	4.32	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1076/1425	3.89	3.77	4.34	4.31	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	780/1271	4.31	3.69	4.16	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1230/1276	3.49	3.71	4.33	4.14	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	947/1273	3.96	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	198/198	1.00	3.52	4.16	3.90	1.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	197/208	3.00	3.70	4.27	4.23	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/43	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.68	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 110 02
Title:	Statics
Instructor:	Farquhar,Anthon

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	1

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/31	5.00	3.89	4.53	4.51	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/36	3.00	3.22	4.43	4.33	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/21	5.00	4.00	4.54	4.63	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	14/20	4.00	3.50	4.45	4.39	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 110 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 21
Title: Statics		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Farquhar,Anthon		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	434/1528	4.60	3.98	4.31	4.16	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	818/1527	4.44	3.82	4.28	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1198/1333	4.46	3.85	4.34	4.26	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	313/1495	4.36	3.86	4.25	4.11	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1361/1439	4.19	3.60	4.11	3.97	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	583/1425	4.47	3.82	4.12	3.93	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1508	4.19	3.76	4.18	4.11	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1337/1490	3.52	3.59	4.11	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1334/1428	3.75	4.08	4.49	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	4.90	4.41	4.74	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1259/1427	3.89	3.74	4.32	4.27	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1255/1425	3.89	3.77	4.34	4.31	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1291	4.25	3.57	4.05	3.97	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	598/1271	4.31	3.69	4.16	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1102/1276	3.49	3.71	4.33	4.14	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1122/1273	3.96	3.97	4.38	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/922	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 110 03	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	21
Title:	Statics			Questionnaires:	3
Instructor:	Farquhar,Anthon				

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	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	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 110 04	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Statics		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Farquhar,Anthon		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1036/1528	4.60	3.98	4.31	4.16	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1113/1527	4.44	3.82	4.28	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	339/1333	4.46	3.85	4.34	4.26	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	657/1495	4.36	3.86	4.25	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	314/1439	4.19	3.60	4.11	3.97	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	301/1425	4.47	3.82	4.12	3.93	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	380/1508	4.19	3.76	4.18	4.11	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1173/1490	3.52	3.59	4.11	4.02	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1350/1428	3.75	4.08	4.49	4.43	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	980/1436	4.90	4.41	4.74	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1080/1427	3.89	3.74	4.32	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1076/1425	3.89	3.77	4.34	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1061/1291	4.25	3.57	4.05	3.97	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	365/1271	4.31	3.69	4.16	3.98	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	1040/1276	3.49	3.71	4.33	4.14	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	857/1273	3.96	3.97	4.38	4.18	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	218/922	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 110 04	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	20
Title:	Statics			Questionnaires:	7
Instructor:	Farquhar,Anthon				

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 204 02				Term - Fall 2010					Enrollment:	20
Title:	Intro Engr Design W/ Cad									Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu										

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	1	2	5	2	3.15	1471/1528	3.41	3.98	4.31	4.34	3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	0	5	2	2.92	1493/1527	3.18	3.82	4.28	4.32	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	2	1	3	3	2.92	1316/1333	3.18	3.85	4.34	4.40	2.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	3.09	1446/1495	3.26	3.86	4.25	4.28	3.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	1	3	1	2.42	1426/1439	2.90	3.60	4.11	4.12	2.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	2	4	1	2.92	1365/1425	3.18	3.82	4.12	4.11	2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	4	4	1	0	2.15	1495/1508	2.69	3.76	4.18	4.19	2.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	797/1526	4.72	4.80	4.66	4.64	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1406/1490	3.22	3.59	4.11	4.11	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1398/1428	3.60	4.08	4.49	4.48	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	1417/1436	3.85	4.41	4.74	4.76	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1339/1427	3.54	3.74	4.32	4.33	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1350/1425	3.50	3.77	4.34	4.37	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1165/1291	3.51	3.57	4.05	4.14	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1271	3.67	3.69	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1276	3.67	3.71	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1273	3.00	3.97	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 204 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Intro Engr Design W/ Cad		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/198	****	3.52	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/208	****	3.70	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/194	****	4.21	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.12	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 204 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 10
Title: Intro Engr Design W/ Cad		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1350/1528	3.41	3.98	4.31	4.34	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1418/1527	3.18	3.82	4.28	4.32	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1258/1333	3.18	3.85	4.34	4.40	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1389/1495	3.26	3.86	4.25	4.28	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1279/1439	2.90	3.60	4.11	4.12	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	3.44	1241/1425	3.18	3.82	4.12	4.11	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1394/1508	2.69	3.76	4.18	4.19	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	919/1526	4.72	4.80	4.66	4.64	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1295/1490	3.22	3.59	4.11	4.11	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1163/1428	3.60	4.08	4.49	4.48	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1364/1436	3.85	4.41	4.74	4.76	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1226/1427	3.54	3.74	4.32	4.33	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1226/1425	3.50	3.77	4.34	4.37	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	882/1291	3.51	3.57	4.05	4.14	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1007/1271	3.67	3.69	4.16	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1102/1276	3.67	3.71	4.33	4.37	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1240/1273	3.00	3.97	4.38	4.43	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 204 03
Title:	Intro Engr Design W/ Cad
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/198	****	3.52	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	3.70	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.21	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.12	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 220 01		Term - Fall 2010							Enrollment: 98			
Title:	Mechanics Of Materials									Questionnaires: 86			
Instructor:	Charalambides,P												

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	6	21	53	4.37	795/1528	4.37	3.98	4.31	4.34	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	9	32	38	4.14	1016/1527	4.14	3.82	4.28	4.32	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	16	24	38	4.06	977/1333	4.06	3.85	4.34	4.40	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	5	8	23	27	4.14	962/1495	4.14	3.86	4.25	4.28	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	16	22	39	4.20	710/1439	4.20	3.60	4.11	4.12	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	1	2	5	15	30	4.34	583/1425	4.34	3.82	4.12	4.11	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	8	25	47	4.31	722/1508	4.31	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	84	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	2	2	8	24	33	4.22	722/1490	4.22	3.59	4.11	4.11	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	16	64	4.66	637/1428	4.66	4.08	4.49	4.48	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	3	82	4.93	361/1436	4.93	4.41	4.74	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	7	34	39	4.20	967/1427	4.20	3.74	4.32	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	11	24	43	4.15	1005/1425	4.15	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	6	6	14	24	20	3.66	998/1291	3.66	3.57	4.05	4.14	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	66	0	3	0	6	3	8	3.65	****/1271	****	3.69	4.16	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	64	0	2	1	1	6	12	4.14	874/1276	4.14	3.71	4.33	4.37	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	65	0	1	2	4	3	11	4.00	****/1273	****	3.97	4.38	4.43	****
4. Were special techniques successful	64	15	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 220 01	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 98
Title:	Mechanics Of Materials			Questionnaires: 86
Instructor:	Charalambides,P			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	82	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/208	****	3.70	4.27	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	84	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	85	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/43	****	4.56	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	85	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	3.89	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	85	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	3.22	4.43	3.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	85	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	4.00	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	85	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	3.50	4.45	3.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	76	Graduate	1	Major	73
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	38						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	9	C	19	General	0	Under-grad	85	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 301 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 71
Title: Struct/Prop:Engr Materls		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Topoleski,L D		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	10	13	4.21	962/1528	4.21	3.98	4.31	4.34	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	4	13	6	3.57	1383/1527	3.57	3.82	4.28	4.27	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	5	6	11	3.68	1196/1333	3.68	3.85	4.34	4.34	3.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	2	0	0	6	8	4.13	982/1495	4.13	3.86	4.25	4.28	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	2	9	11	3.96	895/1439	3.96	3.60	4.11	4.13	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	2	1	1	6	7	3.88	992/1425	3.88	3.82	4.12	4.17	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	11	7	3.64	1278/1508	3.64	3.76	4.18	4.17	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	453/1526	4.93	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	3	9	11	4.08	864/1490	4.08	3.59	4.11	4.11	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	9	12	4.07	1183/1428	4.07	4.08	4.49	4.48	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	548/1436	4.89	4.41	4.74	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	9	14	4.21	950/1427	4.21	3.74	4.32	4.31	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	3	17	4.00	1076/1425	4.00	3.77	4.34	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	1	6	2	9	4.06	701/1291	4.06	3.57	4.05	4.09	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1271	****	3.69	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1276	****	3.71	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1273	****	3.97	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 301 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 71
Title: Struct/Prop:Engr Materls		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Topoleski,L D		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 301H 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	11
Title:	Honors Struct/Prop:Engr		Questionnaires:	10
Instructor:	Topoleski,L D			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	521/1528	4.60	3.98	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	0	3.40	1425/1527	3.40	3.82	4.28	4.27	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1198/1333	3.67	3.85	4.34	4.34	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	3.86	4.25	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	605/1439	4.30	3.60	4.11	4.13	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	816/1425	4.11	3.82	4.12	4.17	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1207/1508	3.80	3.76	4.18	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	742/1526	4.80	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	911/1490	4.00	3.59	4.11	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	735/1428	4.60	4.08	4.49	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	516/1436	4.90	4.41	4.74	4.74	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1041/1427	4.10	3.74	4.32	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1157/1425	3.90	3.77	4.34	4.34	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	882/1291	3.83	3.57	4.05	4.09	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	717/1271	4.14	3.69	4.16	4.19	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	675/1276	4.43	3.71	4.33	4.37	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	706/1273	4.43	3.97	4.38	4.40	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	316/922	4.33	3.92	4.02	4.02	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 301H 02
Title:	Honors Struct/Prop:Engr
Instructor:	Topoleski,L D

| Term - Fall 2010 |

| Enrollment: | 11 |
| Questionnaires: | 10 |

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	1.00	4.34	4.79	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 303 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 31
Title: Topics In Engineer Math		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Vonkerczek,Chri		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	6	3	0	2.64	1513/1528	2.89	3.98	4.31	4.34	2.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	4	4	0	2.64	1509/1527	2.83	3.82	4.28	4.27	2.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	4	1	3.00	1306/1333	3.19	3.85	4.34	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	0	5	1	0	2.44	1484/1495	2.67	3.86	4.25	4.28	2.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	1	3	1	2	2.38	1427/1439	2.25	3.60	4.11	4.13	2.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	1	6	1	0	2.45	1404/1425	2.77	3.82	4.12	4.17	2.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1415/1508	3.14	3.76	4.18	4.17	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1002/1526	4.81	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	6	1	6	1	0	2.14	1483/1490	2.21	3.59	4.11	4.11	2.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	5	2	2	3.08	1398/1428	3.15	4.08	4.49	4.48	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	1402/1436	4.02	4.41	4.74	4.74	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	2	6	0	0	2.08	1419/1427	2.30	3.74	4.32	4.31	2.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	1	3	3	0	2.23	1413/1425	2.52	3.77	4.34	4.34	2.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1231/1291	2.95	3.57	4.05	4.09	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	1007/1271	3.67	3.69	4.16	4.19	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1102/1276	3.67	3.71	4.33	4.37	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	776/1273	4.33	3.97	4.38	4.40	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	197/198	1.69	3.52	4.16	4.26	1.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 303 02	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	31
Title:	Topics In Engineer Math			Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Vonkerczek,Chri				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	205/208	2.30	3.70	4.27	4.31	2.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	192/194	3.10	4.21	4.56	4.59	3.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	190/194	2.51	4.12	4.37	4.37	2.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	3.86	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	3.86	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	3.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	****	4.56	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	3.89	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/36	****	3.22	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/20	****	3.50	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 303 02
Title:	Topics In Engineer Math
Instructor:	Vonkerczek,Chri

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	31
Questionnaires:	15

Questions						NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced																			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C		8		General				0		Under-grad		15		Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D		1													
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F		0		Electives				0		**** - Means there are not enough responses					
				P		0								to be significant					
				I		0		Other				0							
				?		2													

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 303 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Topics In Engineer Math		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Long,Islem O		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	3	7	0	3.33	1447/1528	2.89	3.98	4.31	4.34	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	5	0	3.33	1434/1527	2.83	3.82	4.28	4.27	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	5	2	3.58	1220/1333	3.19	3.85	4.34	4.34	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1440/1495	2.67	3.86	4.25	4.28	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	1	2	2	1	2.36	1428/1439	2.25	3.60	4.11	4.13	2.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1345/1425	2.77	3.82	4.12	4.17	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1231/1508	3.14	3.76	4.18	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	509/1526	4.81	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	2	4	0	2.73	1453/1490	2.21	3.59	4.11	4.11	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1334/1428	3.15	4.08	4.49	4.48	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1352/1436	4.02	4.41	4.74	4.74	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	3	5	0	2.92	1388/1427	2.30	3.74	4.32	4.31	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	3	2	3	3.33	1338/1425	2.52	3.77	4.34	4.34	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	1	6	0	3.63	1013/1291	2.95	3.57	4.05	4.09	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1271	3.67	3.69	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1276	3.67	3.71	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1273	4.33	3.97	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 303 03	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 25
Title:	Topics In Engineer Math			Questionnaires: 14
Instructor:	Long,Islem O			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/198	1.69	3.52	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/208	2.30	3.70	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/194	3.10	4.21	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/194	2.51	4.12	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 303 05	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 27
Title: Topics In Engineer Math		Questionnaires: 27
Instructor: Vonkerczek,Chri		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	6	4	6	5	2	2.70	1511/1528	2.89	3.98	4.31	4.34	2.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	5	6	7	3	1	2.50	1513/1527	2.83	3.82	4.28	4.27	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	3	5	6	5	3	3.00	1306/1333	3.19	3.85	4.34	4.34	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	9	3	4	4	2	0	2.38	1486/1495	2.67	3.86	4.25	4.28	2.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	8	4	4	2	0	2.00	1431/1439	2.25	3.60	4.11	4.13	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	7	2	4	5	2	2	2.87	1374/1425	2.77	3.82	4.12	4.17	2.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	6	6	5	1	4	2.59	1478/1508	3.14	3.76	4.18	4.17	2.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	283/1526	4.81	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	13	3	4	2	0	1.77	1485/1490	2.21	3.59	4.11	4.11	1.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	5	4	5	4	2	2.70	1416/1428	3.15	4.08	4.49	4.48	2.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	6	7	7	4.05	1376/1436	4.02	4.41	4.74	4.74	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	9	6	4	0	1	1.90	1421/1427	2.30	3.74	4.32	4.31	1.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	10	3	5	1	1	2.00	1418/1425	2.52	3.77	4.34	4.34	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1266/1291	2.95	3.57	4.05	4.09	2.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/1271	3.67	3.69	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/1276	3.67	3.71	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	3	1	0	0	2.00	****/1273	4.33	3.97	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 303 05
Title:	Topics In Engineer Math
Instructor:	Vonkerczek,Chri

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 27

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	4	3	2	0	0	1.78	196/198	1.69	3.52	4.16	4.26	1.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	3	4	1	1	0	2.00	207/208	2.30	3.70	4.27	4.31	2.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	3	1	0	3	2	3.00	194/194	3.10	4.21	4.56	4.59	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	3	1	5	0	0	2.22	194/194	2.51	4.12	4.37	4.37	2.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	5	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 304 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 32
Title: Machine Design		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Farquhar,Anthon		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	10	4.09	1084/1528	4.09	3.98	4.31	4.34	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	9	4.14	1016/1527	4.14	3.82	4.28	4.27	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	7	9	3.95	1045/1333	3.95	3.85	4.34	4.34	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	8	9	4.20	903/1495	4.20	3.86	4.25	4.28	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1112/1439	3.69	3.60	4.11	4.13	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1056/1425	3.81	3.82	4.12	4.17	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	5	8	3.95	1093/1508	3.95	3.76	4.18	4.17	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	566/1526	4.90	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1005/1490	3.93	3.59	4.11	4.11	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	10	9	4.18	1126/1428	4.18	4.08	4.49	4.48	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	964/1436	4.73	4.41	4.74	4.74	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	11	5	3.77	1218/1427	3.77	3.74	4.32	4.31	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	5	10	4.14	1021/1425	4.14	3.77	4.34	4.34	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1061/1291	3.50	3.57	4.05	4.09	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	446/1271	4.50	3.69	4.16	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	483/1276	4.63	3.71	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	507/1273	4.67	3.97	4.38	4.40	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	316/922	4.33	3.92	4.02	4.02	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 304 01		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	32
Title:	Machine Design					Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Farquhar,Anthon						

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	1.00	4.34	4.79	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 320 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 93
Title: Fluid Mechanics		Questionnaires: 56
Instructor: Carmi,Shlomo		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	14	19	21	4.09	1084/1528	4.09	3.98	4.31	4.34	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	13	29	13	3.96	1157/1527	3.96	3.82	4.28	4.27	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	9	16	27	4.16	898/1333	4.16	3.85	4.34	4.34	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	1	2	13	11	7	3.62	1326/1495	3.62	3.86	4.25	4.28	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	3	1	14	15	14	3.77	1055/1439	3.77	3.60	4.11	4.13	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	865/1425	4.05	3.82	4.12	4.17	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	17	15	18	3.82	1199/1508	3.82	3.76	4.18	4.17	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	23	31	4.57	1002/1526	4.57	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	3	2	24	12	6	3.34	1334/1490	3.34	3.59	4.11	4.11	3.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	11	20	21	4.07	1183/1428	4.07	4.08	4.49	4.48	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	16	34	4.56	1148/1436	4.56	4.41	4.74	4.74	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	7	26	10	9	3.27	1347/1427	3.27	3.74	4.32	4.31	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	7	18	9	13	3.26	1350/1425	3.26	3.77	4.34	4.34	3.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	9	10	6	9	1	2.51	1257/1291	2.51	3.57	4.05	4.09	2.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	****/1271	****	3.69	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	****/1276	****	3.71	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	****/1273	****	3.97	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	46	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 320 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 93
Title: Fluid Mechanics		Questionnaires: 56
Instructor: Carmi,Shlomo		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/198	****	3.52	4.16	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/208	****	3.70	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.21	4.56	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.12	4.37	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.02	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	3.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	1.00	4.27	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.00	4.27	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	1.00	3.94	4.27	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	3.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.74	4.80	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	3.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	1.00	4.34	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	4.56	4.43	3.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	3.89	4.53	4.75	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	3.22	4.43	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 320 02
Title:	Fluid Mechanics
Instructor:	Carmi,Shlomo

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	93
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	4.00	4.54	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	3.50	4.45	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	0	Major	43
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	17	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 332L 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 13
Title: Solid Mech And Mat Lab		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor: Zupan,Marcus		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	293/1528	4.77	3.98	4.31	4.34	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	760/1527	4.38	3.82	4.28	4.27	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	722/1333	4.38	3.85	4.34	4.34	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	217/1495	4.77	3.86	4.25	4.28	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1126/1439	3.67	3.60	4.11	4.13	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	223/1425	4.69	3.82	4.12	4.17	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1118/1508	3.92	3.76	4.18	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1526	4.92	4.80	4.66	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	243/1490	4.64	3.59	4.11	4.11	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	588/1428	4.69	4.08	4.49	4.48	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.41	4.74	4.74	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	683/1427	4.46	3.74	4.32	4.31	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	830/1425	4.38	3.77	4.34	4.34	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	937/1291	3.75	3.57	4.05	4.09	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1271	****	3.69	4.16	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1276	****	3.71	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1273	****	3.97	4.38	4.40	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 332L 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	13
Title:	Solid Mech And Mat Lab		Questionnaires:	13
Instructor:	Zupan,Marcus			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	87/198	4.40	3.52	4.16	4.26	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/208	4.80	3.70	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/194	5.00	4.21	4.56	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	67/194	4.60	4.12	4.37	4.37	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/176	4.80	3.95	4.23	4.33	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 403 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 51
Title: Automatic Controls		Questionnaires: 46
Instructor: Jiru,Teshome Ed		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	7	17	7	8	3.04	1482/1528	3.04	3.98	4.31	4.39	3.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	20	8	7	3.13	1469/1527	3.13	3.82	4.28	4.30	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	8	18	6	8	3.04	1304/1333	3.04	3.85	4.34	4.37	3.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	2	4	7	7	4	3.29	1419/1495	3.29	3.86	4.25	4.33	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	2	4	8	6	9	3.55	1184/1439	3.55	3.60	4.11	4.20	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	2	5	6	5	3.50	1211/1425	3.50	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	8	10	11	7	9	2.98	1429/1508	2.98	3.76	4.18	4.24	2.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	13	5	15	4	2	2.41	1470/1490	2.41	3.59	4.11	4.19	2.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	16	8	15	3.61	1345/1428	3.61	4.08	4.49	4.54	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	8	11	12	8	7	2.89	1434/1436	2.89	4.41	4.74	4.75	2.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	15	13	7	7	3	2.33	1410/1427	2.33	3.74	4.32	4.37	2.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	16	12	9	3	5	2.31	1410/1425	2.31	3.77	4.34	4.37	2.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	10	9	10	5	5	2.64	1248/1291	2.64	3.57	4.05	4.10	2.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	****/1271	****	3.69	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/1276	****	3.71	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	****/1273	****	3.97	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	3	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 403 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 51
Title:	Automatic Controls		Questionnaires: 46
Instructor:	Jiru,Teshome Ed		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	46	Graduate	0	Major	42
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	4
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	0	to be significant			
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 409 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title:	Mech: Deformable Solids		Questionnaires: 13
Instructor:	Farrokh,Babak		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	390/1528	4.69	3.98	4.31	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	326/1527	4.69	3.82	4.28	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	117/1333	4.92	3.85	4.34	4.37	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	124/1495	4.88	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	239/1439	4.67	3.60	4.11	4.20	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1425	4.43	3.82	4.12	4.26	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	129/1508	4.83	3.76	4.18	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1061/1526	4.50	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	122/1490	4.80	3.59	4.11	4.19	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	177/1428	4.92	4.08	4.49	4.54	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.41	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	193/1427	4.85	3.74	4.32	4.37	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	130/1425	4.92	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	385/1291	4.44	3.57	4.05	4.10	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1271	5.00	3.69	4.16	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1276	5.00	3.71	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1273	5.00	3.97	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 409 01
Title:	Mech: Deformable Solids
Instructor:	Farrokh,Babak

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 412 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Mech Design:Manuf/Prod		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Arola,Dwayne D		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	307/1528	4.75	3.98	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	424/1527	4.63	3.82	4.28	4.30	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	731/1333	4.38	3.85	4.34	4.37	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	313/1495	4.67	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	851/1439	4.00	3.60	4.11	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	891/1425	4.00	3.82	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	329/1508	4.63	3.76	4.18	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	579/1490	4.33	3.59	4.11	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.08	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	612/1436	4.88	4.41	4.74	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	477/1427	4.63	3.74	4.32	4.37	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	349/1425	4.75	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	3.57	4.05	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	3.52	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/208	****	3.70	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.21	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.12	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	3.87	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 412 01		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	16
Title:	Mech Design:Manuf/Prod				Questionnaires:	8
Instructor:	Arola,Dwayne D					

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 432L 02
Title:	Fluids/Energy Lab
Instructor:	Zhu,Liang

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	674/1528	4.69	3.98	4.31	4.39	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	550/1527	4.70	3.82	4.28	4.30	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	458/1333	4.64	3.85	4.34	4.37	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	407/1495	4.49	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	573/1439	4.38	3.60	4.11	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	431/1425	4.64	3.82	4.12	4.26	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	708/1508	4.44	3.76	4.18	4.24	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	464/1490	4.46	3.59	4.11	4.19	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	718/1428	4.81	4.08	4.49	4.54	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	709/1436	4.95	4.41	4.74	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	625/1427	4.81	3.74	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	981/1425	4.56	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	728/1291	4.05	3.57	4.05	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1271	****	3.69	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1276	****	3.71	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1273	****	3.97	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 432L 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Fluids/Energy Lab		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Zhu,Liang		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	16/198	4.86	3.52	4.16	4.37	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/208	4.92	3.70	4.27	4.21	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	167/194	4.61	4.21	4.56	4.52	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	26/194	4.86	4.12	4.37	4.45	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	45/176	4.67	3.95	4.23	3.87	4.58
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	1.00	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	4.56	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.89	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.22	4.43	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	4.00	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	3.50	4.45	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 432L 02	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Fluids/Energy Lab			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor:	Zhu,Liang			

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0			**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				I	0	Other	0	to be significant			
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 432L 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 20
Title: Fluids/Energy Lab		Questionnaires: 10
Instructor: Zhu,Liang		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1528	4.69	3.98	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	117/1527	4.70	3.82	4.28	4.30	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1333	4.64	3.85	4.34	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	177/1495	4.49	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1439	4.38	3.60	4.11	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	87/1425	4.64	3.82	4.12	4.26	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	352/1508	4.44	3.76	4.18	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	142/1490	4.46	3.59	4.11	4.19	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1428	4.81	4.08	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	4.95	4.41	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1427	4.81	3.74	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1425	4.56	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	634/1291	4.05	3.57	4.05	4.10	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/198	4.86	3.52	4.16	4.37	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/208	4.92	3.70	4.27	4.21	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	49/194	4.61	4.21	4.56	4.52	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/194	4.86	4.12	4.37	4.45	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	34/176	4.67	3.95	4.23	3.87	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 432L 03	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 20
Title:	Fluids/Energy Lab			Questionnaires: 10
Instructor:	Zhu,Liang			

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 432L 04	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 17
Title: Fluids/Energy Lab		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Zhu,Liang		

Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	544/1528	4.69	3.98	4.31	4.39	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	368/1527	4.70	3.82	4.28	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	769/1333	4.64	3.85	4.34	4.37	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1002/1495	4.49	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1020/1439	4.38	3.60	4.11	4.20	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	358/1425	4.64	3.82	4.12	4.26	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	572/1508	4.44	3.76	4.18	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	778/1490	4.46	3.59	4.11	4.19	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	335/1428	4.81	4.08	4.49	4.54	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	4.95	4.41	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	124/1427	4.81	3.74	4.32	4.37	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	578/1425	4.56	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	728/1291	4.05	3.57	4.05	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1271	****	3.69	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1276	****	3.71	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1273	****	3.97	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 432L 04	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 17
Title: Fluids/Energy Lab		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Zhu,Liang		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	22/198	4.86	3.52	4.16	4.37	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/208	4.92	3.70	4.27	4.21	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/194	4.61	4.21	4.56	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	37/194	4.86	4.12	4.37	4.45	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/176	4.67	3.95	4.23	3.87	4.75
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	4.42	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	4.56	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	3.89	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/36	****	3.22	4.43	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	4.00	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	3.50	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 432L 04		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	17
Title:	Fluids/Energy Lab				Questionnaires:	14
Instructor:	Zhu,Liang					

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

84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	0
				?	3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 444 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 30
Title: Mech Engr Systems Design		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	1	1	8	9	3.63	1368/1528	3.52	3.98	4.31	4.39	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	8	8	3.67	1352/1527	3.32	3.82	4.28	4.30	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	8	8	3.71	1188/1333	3.71	3.85	4.34	4.37	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	5	0	2	7	8	3.59	1334/1495	3.47	3.86	4.25	4.33	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1126/1439	3.36	3.60	4.11	4.20	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	3	7	6	3.60	1167/1425	3.46	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	4	3	11	3.63	1285/1508	2.77	3.76	4.18	4.24	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	3	1	0	4	16	4.21	1332/1526	4.60	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	1	2	10	2	3.26	1358/1490	3.30	3.59	4.11	4.19	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	1065/1428	3.96	4.08	4.49	4.54	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	4	14	4.36	1277/1436	4.19	4.41	4.74	4.75	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	1016/1427	3.69	3.74	4.32	4.37	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	7	9	3.91	1157/1425	3.70	3.77	4.34	4.37	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	3	6	7	3.84	875/1291	3.48	3.57	4.05	4.10	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	2	3	3	3.25	1156/1271	3.15	3.69	4.16	4.33	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	3	3	4	3.58	1132/1276	3.11	3.71	4.33	4.49	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1150/1273	3.53	3.97	4.38	4.55	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	844/922	2.73	3.92	4.02	4.23	3.13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 444 01		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Mech Engr Systems Design				Questionnaires:	24
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	4.03	3.52	4.16	4.37	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/208	4.13	3.70	4.27	4.21	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	4.55	4.21	4.56	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	4.39	4.12	4.37	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/176	4.17	3.95	4.23	3.87	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	1.00	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	2.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	1.00	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/43	3.67	4.56	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	2.67	3.89	4.53	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 444 01		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Mech Engr Systems Design				Questionnaires:	24
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu					

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

84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses
				P	0			to be significant
				I	0	Other	0	
				?	2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 444 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 12
Title: Mech Engr Systems Design		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1295/1528	3.52	3.98	4.31	4.39	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1390/1527	3.32	3.82	4.28	4.30	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1104/1333	3.71	3.85	4.34	4.37	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1047/1495	3.47	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1323/1439	3.36	3.60	4.11	4.20	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1075/1425	3.46	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	2.22	1493/1508	2.77	3.76	4.18	4.24	2.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	783/1526	4.60	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	1387/1490	3.30	3.59	4.11	4.19	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1270/1428	3.96	4.08	4.49	4.54	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1367/1436	4.19	4.41	4.74	4.75	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1273/1427	3.69	3.74	4.32	4.37	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1076/1425	3.70	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1194/1291	3.48	3.57	4.05	4.10	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1168/1271	3.15	3.69	4.16	4.33	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	4	0	1	0	2.40	1263/1276	3.11	3.71	4.33	4.49	2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1221/1273	3.53	3.97	4.38	4.55	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	906/922	2.73	3.92	4.02	4.23	2.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 444 02		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	12
Title:	Mech Engr Systems Design				Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu					

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	110/198	4.03	3.52	4.16	4.37	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	85/208	4.13	3.70	4.27	4.21	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	141/194	4.55	4.21	4.56	4.52	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	135/194	4.39	4.12	4.37	4.45	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	110/176	4.17	3.95	4.23	3.87	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	1.00	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	2.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	1.00	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	1.00	4.34	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	35/43	3.67	4.56	4.43	4.63	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	31/31	2.67	3.89	4.53	4.17	2.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	31/36	3.67	3.22	4.43	4.38	3.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 444 02		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	12
Title:	Mech Engr Systems Design					Questionnaires:	9
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	4.00	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/20	****	3.50	4.45	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 444 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 18
Title: Mech Engr Systems Design		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	4	2	3.17	1470/1528	3.52	3.98	4.31	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	3	2	2	2.75	1505/1527	3.32	3.82	4.28	4.30	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1231/1333	3.71	3.85	4.34	4.37	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	2	3	2	2.83	1475/1495	3.47	3.86	4.25	4.33	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1333/1439	3.36	3.60	4.11	4.20	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1345/1425	3.46	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	1	2	1	2.45	1484/1508	2.77	3.76	4.18	4.24	2.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	724/1526	4.60	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1269/1490	3.30	3.59	4.11	4.19	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1322/1428	3.96	4.08	4.49	4.54	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1372/1436	4.19	4.41	4.74	4.75	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1344/1427	3.69	3.74	4.32	4.37	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1358/1425	3.70	3.77	4.34	4.37	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1024/1291	3.48	3.57	4.05	4.10	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1195/1271	3.15	3.69	4.16	4.33	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1193/1276	3.11	3.71	4.33	4.49	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1059/1273	3.53	3.97	4.38	4.55	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/922	2.73	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 444 03		Term - Fall 2010				Enrollment:	18
Title:	Mech Engr Systems Design						Questionnaires:	12
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu							

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	152/198	4.03	3.52	4.16	4.37	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	177/208	4.13	3.70	4.27	4.21	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	104/194	4.55	4.21	4.56	4.52	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	93/194	4.39	4.12	4.37	4.45	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	110/176	4.17	3.95	4.23	3.87	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/66	****	1.00	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/76	****	2.00	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	1.00	3.94	4.23	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	3.00	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	1.00	4.34	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 444 03
Title:	Mech Engr Systems Design
Instructor:	Tshibangu,Wa-Mu

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

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

56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 482L 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 9
Title: Controls/Vib Lab		Questionnaires: 9
Instructor: Jiru,Teshome Ed		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1462/1528	2.36	3.98	4.31	4.39	3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	1	0	2.44	1515/1527	2.35	3.82	4.28	4.30	2.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	2	1	0	0	1.50	1330/1333	1.38	3.85	4.34	4.37	1.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1475/1495	2.54	3.86	4.25	4.33	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1439	1.00	3.60	4.11	4.20	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1306/1425	2.88	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	1	4	0	2.78	1465/1508	2.89	3.76	4.18	4.24	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	2.67	1455/1490	2.21	3.59	4.11	4.19	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1354/1428	2.78	4.08	4.49	4.54	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1434/1436	2.32	4.41	4.74	4.75	2.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	1401/1427	2.08	3.74	4.32	4.37	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	4	0	1	2.33	1410/1425	1.92	3.77	4.34	4.37	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1231/1291	2.93	3.57	4.05	4.10	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1271	1.67	3.69	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1276	3.33	3.71	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1273	3.00	3.97	4.38	4.55	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	161/198	3.63	3.52	4.16	4.37	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 482L 02
Title:	Controls/Vib Lab
Instructor:	Jiru,Teshome Ed

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	193/208	2.63	3.70	4.27	4.21	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	76/194	4.00	4.21	4.56	4.52	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	93/194	4.13	4.12	4.37	4.45	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	169/176	2.25	3.95	4.23	3.87	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 482L 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 4
Title: Controls/Vib Lab		Questionnaires: 4
Instructor: Jiru,Teshome Ed		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1528/1528	2.36	3.98	4.31	4.39	1.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1521/1527	2.35	3.82	4.28	4.30	2.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	1331/1333	1.38	3.85	4.34	4.37	1.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1491/1495	2.54	3.86	4.25	4.33	2.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1439/1439	1.00	3.60	4.11	4.20	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1399/1425	2.88	3.82	4.12	4.26	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1422/1508	2.89	3.76	4.18	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1486/1490	2.21	3.59	4.11	4.19	1.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1426/1428	2.78	4.08	4.49	4.54	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	1436/1436	2.32	4.41	4.74	4.75	1.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1427/1427	2.08	3.74	4.32	4.37	1.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1424/1425	1.92	3.77	4.34	4.37	1.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1194/1291	2.93	3.57	4.05	4.10	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1267/1271	1.67	3.69	4.16	4.33	1.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1193/1276	3.33	3.71	4.33	4.49	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1240/1273	3.00	3.97	4.38	4.55	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.23	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 482L 03		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	4
Title:	Controls/Vib Lab					Questionnaires:	4
Instructor:	Jiru,Teshome Ed						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	170/198	3.63	3.52	4.16	4.37	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	208/208	2.63	3.70	4.27	4.21	1.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	190/194	4.00	4.21	4.56	4.52	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	175/194	4.13	4.12	4.37	4.45	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	176/176	2.25	3.95	4.23	3.87	1.50
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	74/74	1.00	1.00	4.31	4.42	1.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	66/66	1.00	1.00	4.27	4.26	1.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	74/76	2.00	2.00	4.27	4.42	2.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	72/73	1.00	1.00	3.94	4.23	1.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/42	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.73	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/41	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.33	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/30	4.00	4.00	4.74	4.57	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	30/32	3.00	3.00	4.20	4.24	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	29/29	1.00	1.00	4.34	4.11	1.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/43	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.63	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/31	4.00	3.89	4.53	4.17	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	34/36	3.00	3.22	4.43	4.38	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	21/21	3.00	4.00	4.54	4.33	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 482L 03		Term - Fall 2010				Enrollment: 4
Title:	Controls/Vib Lab						Questionnaires: 4
Instructor:	Jiru,Teshome Ed						

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	20/20	3.00	3.50	4.45	4.00	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 489 02		Term - Fall 2010									Enrollment: 31			
Title:	Spec Topics In Mech Engr											Questionnaires: 22			
Instructor:	Mogavero,Marc A														

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	9	5	1	2.90	1503/1528	3.94	3.98	4.31	4.39	2.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	7	5	1	2.76	1505/1527	3.69	3.82	4.28	4.30	2.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	9	5	2	3.00	1306/1333	3.70	3.85	4.34	4.37	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	5	10	1	3.30	1417/1495	3.76	3.86	4.25	4.33	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	4	6	3	1	2.61	1417/1439	3.63	3.60	4.11	4.20	2.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	3	5	3	3	3.13	1333/1425	3.37	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	4	8	5	3.65	1274/1508	3.98	3.76	4.18	4.24	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	1091/1526	4.71	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	7	7	3	0	2.50	1459/1490	3.57	3.59	4.11	4.19	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	8	2	6	3.33	1382/1428	4.11	4.08	4.49	4.54	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	6	7	1	6	3.24	1428/1436	4.37	4.41	4.74	4.75	3.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	9	3	4	0	2.29	1413/1427	3.57	3.74	4.32	4.37	2.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	4	1	5	0	2.00	1418/1425	3.55	3.77	4.34	4.37	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	3	3	4	3	2.94	1212/1291	3.62	3.57	4.05	4.10	2.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	3	2	0	1	2.38	1249/1271	3.19	3.69	4.16	4.33	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1255/1276	3.42	3.71	4.33	4.49	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1083/1273	4.21	3.97	4.38	4.55	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 489 02		Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	31
Title:	Spec Topics In Mech Engr				Questionnaires:	22
Instructor:	Mogavero,Marc A					

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	4	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 489 03	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment:	30
Title:	Spec Topics In Mech Engr			Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Mogavero,Marc A				

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	613/1528	3.94	3.98	4.31	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	607/1527	3.69	3.82	4.28	4.30	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	5	13	4.24	836/1333	3.70	3.85	4.34	4.37	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	15	4.36	708/1495	3.76	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	3	7	8	3.90	963/1439	3.63	3.60	4.11	4.20	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	6	10	4	3.44	1241/1425	3.37	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	530/1508	3.98	3.76	4.18	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	939/1526	4.71	4.80	4.66	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	800/1490	3.57	3.59	4.11	4.19	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	735/1428	4.11	4.08	4.49	4.54	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	580/1436	4.37	4.41	4.74	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	6	12	4.16	991/1427	3.57	3.74	4.32	4.37	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	14	4.24	937/1425	3.55	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	8	3	14	4.24	546/1291	3.62	3.57	4.05	4.10	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	780/1271	3.19	3.69	4.16	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	824/1276	3.42	3.71	4.33	4.49	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	507/1273	4.21	3.97	4.38	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 489 03		Term - Fall 2010			Enrollment:	30
Title:	Spec Topics In Mech Engr					Questionnaires:	25
Instructor:	Mogavero,Marc A						

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	11				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 489 09	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Spec Topics In Mech Engr			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Quinn,George D			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	9	12	4.41	765/1528	3.94	3.98	4.31	4.39	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	14	3	3.82	1273/1527	3.69	3.82	4.28	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	10	6	3.86	1110/1333	3.70	3.85	4.34	4.37	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	3	5	3	5	3.63	1321/1495	3.76	3.86	4.25	4.33	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	541/1439	3.63	3.60	4.11	4.20	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	5	7	3	3.56	1189/1425	3.37	3.82	4.12	4.26	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	6	8	3.86	1164/1508	3.98	3.76	4.18	4.24	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1526	4.71	4.80	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	14	3	4.05	878/1490	3.57	3.59	4.11	4.19	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	11	4.41	965/1428	4.11	4.08	4.49	4.54	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1436	4.37	4.41	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	899/1427	3.57	3.74	4.32	4.37	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	815/1425	3.55	3.77	4.34	4.37	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	978/1291	3.62	3.57	4.05	4.10	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1271	3.19	3.69	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1276	3.42	3.71	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1273	4.21	3.97	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.23	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 489 09	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 26
Title:	Spec Topics In Mech Engr			Questionnaires: 23
Instructor:	Quinn,George D			

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	5	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	12	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 631 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 22
Title: Adv. Cond. & Radiation H		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Ma,Ronghui		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	855/1528	4.32	3.98	4.31	4.45	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	623/1527	4.47	3.82	4.28	4.36	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	676/1333	4.42	3.85	4.34	4.39	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	772/1495	4.32	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	744/1439	4.17	3.60	4.11	4.24	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	692/1425	4.24	3.82	4.12	4.28	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	558/1508	4.42	3.76	4.18	4.25	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1061/1526	4.50	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	555/1490	4.35	3.59	4.11	4.16	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	478/1428	4.75	4.08	4.49	4.56	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	870/1436	4.79	4.41	4.74	4.83	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	742/1427	4.42	3.74	4.32	4.36	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	886/1425	4.32	3.77	4.34	4.34	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	814/1291	3.92	3.57	4.05	3.99	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1195/1271	3.00	3.69	4.16	4.27	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1128/1276	3.60	3.71	4.33	4.43	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1059/1273	3.80	3.97	4.38	4.52	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/922	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 631 01	Term - Fall 2010		Enrollment: 22
Title: Adv. Cond. & Radiation H			Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Ma,Ronghui			

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	7	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 640 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 11
Title: Fund Fluid Mech I		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Eggleton,Charle		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	492/1528	4.63	3.98	4.31	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	424/1527	4.63	3.82	4.28	4.36	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	731/1333	4.38	3.85	4.34	4.39	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	746/1495	4.33	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1342/1439	3.14	3.60	4.11	4.24	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1425	4.75	3.82	4.12	4.28	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	626/1508	4.38	3.76	4.18	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1185/1526	4.38	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	464/1490	4.43	3.59	4.11	4.16	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	303/1428	4.86	4.08	4.49	4.56	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	677/1436	4.86	4.41	4.74	4.83	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	891/1427	4.29	3.74	4.32	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	407/1425	4.71	3.77	4.34	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1024/1291	3.60	3.57	4.05	3.99	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1077/1271	3.50	3.69	4.16	4.27	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1230/1276	3.00	3.71	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	947/1273	4.00	3.97	4.38	4.52	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 640 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 11
Title:	Fund Fluid Mech I		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor:	Eggleton,Charle		

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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	4	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
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	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 812 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Spec Top Mech Systems		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Su,Haijun		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Org Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	238/1528	4.28	3.98	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	639/1527	4.23	3.82	4.28	4.36	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	415/1333	4.45	3.85	4.34	4.39	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	560/1495	4.36	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	1	9	3.93	929/1439	3.72	3.60	4.11	4.24	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	0	5	5	3.92	967/1425	4.03	3.82	4.12	4.28	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	419/1508	4.14	3.76	4.18	4.25	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1526	4.63	4.80	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	479/1490	3.71	3.59	4.11	4.16	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	1114/1428	4.18	4.08	4.49	4.56	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	361/1436	4.80	4.41	4.74	4.83	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	772/1427	4.20	3.74	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	378/1425	4.47	3.77	4.34	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	690/1291	2.79	3.57	4.05	3.99	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	780/1271	4.00	3.69	4.16	4.27	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1053/1276	3.78	3.71	4.33	4.43	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	599/1273	3.78	3.97	4.38	4.52	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	680/922	3.63	3.92	4.02	4.00	3.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 812 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Spec Top Mech Systems		Questionnaires: 15
Instructor: Su,Haijun		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	3.52	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	3.70	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.21	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.12	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/176	****	3.95	4.23	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	1.00	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	1.00	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	2.00	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	1.00	3.94	3.81	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	5.00	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	5.00	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	4.00	4.74	4.95	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	1.00	4.34	4.36	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	4.56	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.89	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/36	****	3.22	4.43	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	4.00	4.54	4.68	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 812 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment:	16
Title:	Spec Top Mech Systems		Questionnaires:	15
Instructor:	Su,Haijun			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	3.50	4.45	4.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	9	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			
				P	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 812 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 7
Title: Spec Top Mech Systems		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Zhu,Weidong		

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Org | UMBC | Level | Sect |
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1306/1528	4.28	3.98	4.31	4.45	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1113/1527	4.23	3.82	4.28	4.36	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	830/1333	4.45	3.85	4.34	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	844/1495	4.36	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1216/1439	3.72	3.60	4.11	4.24	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	786/1425	4.03	3.82	4.12	4.28	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1231/1508	4.14	3.76	4.18	4.25	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1285/1526	4.63	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1406/1490	3.71	3.59	4.11	4.16	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1138/1428	4.18	4.08	4.49	4.56	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1043/1436	4.80	4.41	4.74	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1080/1427	4.20	3.74	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	966/1425	4.47	3.77	4.34	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1287/1291	2.79	3.57	4.05	3.99	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1271	4.00	3.69	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1276	3.78	3.71	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1240/1273	3.78	3.97	4.38	4.52	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/922	3.63	3.92	4.02	4.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 812 03	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 7
Title: Spec Top Mech Systems		Questionnaires: 8
Instructor: Zhu,Weidong		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	3.52	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	3.70	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/194	****	4.21	4.56	4.58	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 815 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 7
Title: Spec Top Solid Mechanics		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Khan,Akhtar		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1528	4.86	3.98	4.31	4.45	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	704/1527	4.43	3.82	4.28	4.36	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	339/1333	4.71	3.85	4.34	4.39	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	496/1495	4.50	3.86	4.25	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	472/1439	4.43	3.60	4.11	4.24	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	249/1425	4.67	3.82	4.12	4.28	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	746/1508	4.29	3.76	4.18	4.25	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	867/1526	4.71	4.80	4.66	4.81	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	289/1490	4.57	3.59	4.11	4.16	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	553/1428	4.71	4.08	4.49	4.56	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.41	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	541/1427	4.57	3.74	4.32	4.36	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	5.00	3.77	4.34	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1291	5.00	3.57	4.05	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	446/1271	4.50	3.69	4.16	4.27	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	506/1276	4.60	3.71	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1273	4.83	3.97	4.38	4.52	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENME 815 02	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 7
Title:	Spec Top Solid Mechanics		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor:	Khan,Akhtar		

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

Frequency Distribution

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