

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>227</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	9	12	36	78	85	3.99	1227/1644	3.99	3.99	4.32	4.16	3.99
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	4	23	43	76	75	3.88	1316/1644	3.88	3.88	4.28	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	80	2	8	28	59	43	3.95	1126/1419	3.95	3.95	4.35	4.25	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	7	9	12	50	76	66	3.84	1252/1596	3.84	3.84	4.24	4.09	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	33	42	41	44	32	26	2.78	1504/1535	2.78	2.78	4.15	4.02	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	19	19	31	54	55	40	3.33	1374/1510	3.33	3.33	4.13	3.91	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	1	21	31	51	51	63	3.48	1442/1620	3.48	3.48	4.20	4.13	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	1	0	0	0	37	177	4.83	798/1642	4.83	4.83	4.68	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	47	6	2	5	31	85	51	4.02	957/1596	4.10	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	3	10	55	148	4.61	755/1534	4.65	4.65	4.48	4.45	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	1	7	29	178	4.77	970/1539	4.80	4.80	4.76	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	10	35	73	96	4.19	1045/1531	4.19	4.19	4.33	4.30	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	8	10	40	62	93	4.04	1143/1530	4.06	4.06	4.35	4.30	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	13	11	12	42	53	79	3.90	929/1409	3.92	3.92	4.08	3.97	3.92
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	17	14	45	63	66	3.72	1074/1366	3.72	3.72	4.18	3.96	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	12	23	50	66	54	3.62	1192/1364	3.62	3.62	4.33	4.10	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	11	12	54	60	67	3.78	1146/1361	3.78	3.78	4.39	4.17	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	23	43	16	18	41	49	37	3.45	865/1019	3.45	3.45	4.09	3.97	3.45

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>227</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	177	7	4	2	11	17	9	3.58	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	177	0	8	3	15	15	9	3.28	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	176	5	2	5	15	14	10	3.54	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	178	6	4	4	8	18	9	3.56	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	178	9	1	2	11	13	13	3.88	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	184	8	1	0	9	15	10	3.94	****/72	****	****	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	185	10	0	2	6	15	9	3.97	****/71	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	186	13	0	1	5	14	8	4.04	****/68	****	****	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	186	3	1	3	11	15	8	3.68	****/71	****	****	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	186	3	3	5	9	13	8	3.47	****/73	****	****	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	188	0	5	4	8	9	13	3.54	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	189	0	4	3	10	9	12	3.58	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	189	3	0	2	7	11	15	4.11	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	188	7	0	1	10	14	7	3.84	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	188	8	0	3	9	12	7	3.74	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	189	0	5	0	14	8	11	3.53	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	189	9	4	1	7	10	7	3.52	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	189	7	0	4	4	17	6	3.81	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>227</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	189	8	0	2	12	10	6	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	190	8	0	1	11	11	6	3.76	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	67	0.00-0.99	9	A	62	Required for Majors	195	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	22	1.00-1.99	0	B	112						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	5	C	20	General	0	Under-grad	227	Non-major	60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	26						

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>227</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	9	12	36	78	85	3.99	1227/1644	3.99	3.99	4.32	4.16	3.99
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	4	23	43	76	75	3.88	1316/1644	3.88	3.88	4.28	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	80	2	8	28	59	43	3.95	1126/1419	3.95	3.95	4.35	4.25	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	7	9	12	50	76	66	3.84	1252/1596	3.84	3.84	4.24	4.09	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	33	42	41	44	32	26	2.78	1504/1535	2.78	2.78	4.15	4.02	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	19	19	31	54	55	40	3.33	1374/1510	3.33	3.33	4.13	3.91	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	1	21	31	51	51	63	3.48	1442/1620	3.48	3.48	4.20	4.13	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	1	0	0	0	37	177	4.83	798/1642	4.83	4.83	4.68	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	58	4	2	4	24	68	67	4.18	809/1596	4.10	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.10
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	1	4	49	146	4.68	643/1534	4.65	4.65	4.48	4.45	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	0	3	25	172	4.83	837/1539	4.80	4.80	4.76	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	2	9	32	64	94	4.19	1053/1531	4.19	4.19	4.33	4.30	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	2	6	7	38	59	87	4.09	1123/1530	4.06	4.06	4.35	4.30	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	13	11	7	40	49	77	3.95	883/1409	3.92	3.92	4.08	3.97	3.92
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	17	14	45	63	66	3.72	1074/1366	3.72	3.72	4.18	3.96	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	12	23	50	66	54	3.62	1192/1364	3.62	3.62	4.33	4.10	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	11	12	54	60	67	3.78	1146/1361	3.78	3.78	4.39	4.17	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	23	43	16	18	41	49	37	3.45	865/1019	3.45	3.45	4.09	3.97	3.45

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>227</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	177	7	4	2	11	17	9	3.58	****/185	****	****	4.23	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	177	0	8	3	15	15	9	3.28	****/209	****	****	4.19	4.18	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	176	5	2	5	15	14	10	3.54	****/181	****	****	4.53	4.68	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	178	6	4	4	8	18	9	3.56	****/183	****	****	4.46	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	178	9	1	2	11	13	13	3.88	****/172	****	****	4.14	4.22	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	184	8	1	0	9	15	10	3.94	****/72	****	****	4.53	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	185	10	0	2	6	15	9	3.97	****/71	****	****	4.38	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	186	13	0	1	5	14	8	4.04	****/68	****	****	4.41	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	186	3	1	3	11	15	8	3.68	****/71	****	****	4.40	4.19	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	186	3	3	5	9	13	8	3.47	****/73	****	****	4.09	3.85	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	188	0	5	4	8	9	13	3.54	****/48	****	****	4.16	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	189	0	4	3	10	9	12	3.58	****/45	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	189	3	0	2	7	11	15	4.11	****/30	****	****	4.57	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	188	7	0	1	10	14	7	3.84	****/27	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	188	8	0	3	9	12	7	3.74	****/25	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	189	0	5	0	14	8	11	3.53	****/51	****	****	4.03	4.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	189	9	4	1	7	10	7	3.52	****/31	****	****	4.18	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	189	7	0	4	4	17	6	3.81	****/36	****	****	4.33	4.38	****

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

**Term - Fall 2013**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>227</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	189	8	0	2	12	10	6	3.67	****/19	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	190	8	0	1	11	11	6	3.76	****/14	****	****	4.17	4.35	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	67	0.00-0.99	9	A	62	Required for Majors	195	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	22	1.00-1.99	0	B	112						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	5	C	20	General	0	Under-grad	227	Non-major	60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	26						