**Course-Section: STEM 506 01** 

Title: The Designed World

**Instructor: Gurganus, Jamie** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	6	6	3	1	2.94	1619/1644	3.50	4.17	4.32	4.42	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	2	2	2.88	1601/1644	3.40	4.20	4.28	4.32	2.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1419	****	4.34	4.35	4.45	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	4	4	2	3.06	1535/1596	3.53	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	1176/1535	3.98	4.15	4.15	4.25	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	4	6	1	3.13	1430/1510	3.70	4.14	4.13	4.24	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	5	4	1	0	2.07	1606/1620	3.33	4.25	4.20	4.29	2.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	442/1642	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.82	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	7	2	0	2.62	1572/1596	3.18	4.13	4.12	4.20	2.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	6	2	3	3.20	1494/1534	3.70	4.50	4.48	4.52	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1136/1539	4.70	4.62	4.76	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	7	4	1	3	3.00	1473/1531	3.60	4.32	4.33	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	2	4	3.31	1435/1530	3.59	4.26	4.35	4.38	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	4	3	5	1	2.81	1357/1409	3.41	4.06	4.08	4.04	2.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	1089/1366	3.88	4.27	4.18	4.26	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	877/1364	4.29	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	842/1361	4.49	4.48	4.39	4.49	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	3	1	3.15	950/1019	3.38	4.14	4.09	4.12	3.15

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: STEM 506 01** 

**Title: The Designed World** 

**Instructor: Gurganus, Jamie** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/209	****	3.43	4.19	4.03	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/172	****	3.00	4.14	4.27	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/72	****	3.45	4.53	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.56	4.38	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	3.56	4.41	4.37	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/71	****	3.72	4.40	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.53	4.09	4.09	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/51	****	3.13	4.03	3.66	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	3.07	4.18	3.73	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: STEM 506 01

Title: The Designed World

Instructor: Gurganus, Jamie

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	3.69	4.33	4.41	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

**Course-Section: STEM 506 02** 

Title: The Designed World

**Instructor:** Irish, Teresa J.

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 15

	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank						Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	9	4	4.07	1172/1644	3.50	4.17	4.32	4.42	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1277/1644	3.40	4.20	4.28	4.32	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1419	****	4.34	4.35	4.45	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	1129/1596	3.53	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	781/1535	3.98	4.15	4.15	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	715/1510	3.70	4.14	4.13	4.24	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	397/1620	3.33	4.25	4.20	4.29	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	442/1642	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.82	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1240/1596	3.18	4.13	4.12	4.20	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	1194/1534	3.70	4.50	4.48	4.52	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	1028/1539	4.70	4.62	4.76	4.79	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	1037/1531	3.60	4.32	4.33	4.34	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1252/1530	3.59	4.26	4.35	4.38	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	825/1409	3.41	4.06	4.08	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	2	7	4.07	845/1366	3.88	4.27	4.18	4.26	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	817/1364	4.29	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	619/1361	4.49	4.48	4.39	4.49	4.60

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: STEM 506 02** 

**Title: The Designed World** 

**Instructor:** Irish, Teresa J.

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 15

**Questionnaires: 15** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	802/1019	3.38	4.14	4.09	4.12	3.62

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	Α	10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: STEM 509 01** 

Title: Environmenta Engineering

**Instructor: Ruben, Katherine** 

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	2	3	4	3	2.88	1627/1644	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.42	2.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	2	7	1	2.82	1606/1644	2.61	4.20	4.28	4.32	2.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1419	****	4.34	4.35	4.45	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	6	6	0	3.13	1528/1596	3.38	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	8	3	1	2.82	1501/1535	2.94	4.15	4.15	4.25	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	8	0	3.18	1420/1510	3.06	4.14	4.13	4.24	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	6	2	3.29	1497/1620	4.43	4.25	4.20	4.29	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.72	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	6	5	4	1	3.00	1524/1596	3.67	4.13	4.12	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1275/1534	4.69	4.50	4.48	4.52	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	990/1539	4.92	4.62	4.76	4.79	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	6	2	1	2.80	1495/1531	3.60	4.32	4.33	4.34	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	3	3	1	2.44	1510/1530	3.48	4.26	4.35	4.38	2.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	1370/1409	3.23	4.06	4.08	4.04	2.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	3	4	3	3.06	1273/1366	3.35	4.27	4.18	4.26	3.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	5	0	6	4	3.44	1238/1364	4.15	4.36	4.33	4.46	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	0	5	6	3.69	1184/1361	4.56	4.48	4.39	4.49	3.69

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: STEM 509 01

**Title: Environmenta Engineering** 

**Instructor:** Ruben, Katherine

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 17

**Questionnaires: 17** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	878/1019	3.81	4.14	4.09	4.12	3.43

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: STEM 509 02** 

**Title: Environmenta Engineering** 

**Instructor:** Ruben, Katherine

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 1

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1603/1644	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1642/1644	2.61	4.20	4.28	4.32	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1540/1596	3.38	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1534/1535	2.94	4.15	4.15	4.25	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1505/1510	3.06	4.14	4.13	4.24	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1620	4.43	4.25	4.20	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.72	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1524/1596	3.67	4.13	4.12	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1534	4.69	4.50	4.48	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1539	4.92	4.62	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1473/1531	3.60	4.32	4.33	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1469/1530	3.48	4.26	4.35	4.38	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1316/1409	3.23	4.06	4.08	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1353/1366	3.35	4.27	4.18	4.26	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1014/1364	4.15	4.36	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1361	4.56	4.48	4.39	4.49	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: STEM 509 02

Title: Environmenta Engineering

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

**Instructor:** Ruben, Katherine

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	961/1019	3.81	4.14	4.09	4.12	3.00

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		<b>Expected Grades</b>		Reasons	Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	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 ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: STEM 509 03** 

Title: Environmenta Engineering

**Instructor:** Ruben, Katherine

**Term - Fall 2013** 

Enrollment: 1

			Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1218/1644	3.29	4.17	4.32	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1589/1644	2.61	4.20	4.28	4.32	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1596	3.38	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1535	2.94	4.15	4.15	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	921/1510	3.06	4.14	4.13	4.24	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1620	4.43	4.25	4.20	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1642	5.00	4.72	4.68	4.82	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1596	3.67	4.13	4.12	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1534	4.69	4.50	4.48	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1539	4.92	4.62	4.76	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1531	3.60	4.32	4.33	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1530	3.48	4.26	4.35	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	825/1409	3.23	4.06	4.08	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1366	3.35	4.27	4.18	4.26	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1364	4.15	4.36	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1361	4.56	4.48	4.39	4.49	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: STEM 509 03

Title: Environmenta Engineering

Term - Fall 2013

Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

**Instructor:** Ruben, Katherine

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1019	3.81	4.14	4.09	4.12	5.00

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		<b>Expected Grades</b>		Reasons	Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	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 ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						