Course-Section: ENES 101 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 638 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eanei	ncies	:		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	IIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		Mean		Mean	
		Genera																
1 Did v	ou dain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.30	780/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.30
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	661/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.40
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	624/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.40
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	807/1424		4.27	4.21	4.06	4.20
				what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	2		1114/1396		4.07	3.98	3.89	3.44
				to what you learned	0	1	0	3	1	3	2		1145/1342		4.12	4.07	3.88	3.44
		g system clear			0	0	0	0	4	1	5		909/1459		4.19	4.16	4.17	4.10
		was class cand		21100	0	0	1	0	0	4	5		1260/1480		4.64			4.20
	-			ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4		4.50	334/1450			4.09		4.50
		Lectur	re															
1. Were	the instr	actor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	762/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.80
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	- ,	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.40
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/1400		4.35	4.27	4.19	4.40
				your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	442/1179	3.97	3.94		3.85	4.25
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	674/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.10
2. Were	all studer	nts actively er	ncourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	978/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.90
3. Did t	he instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	860/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.10
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	essful		0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	358/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.13
		Labora	atory															
1. Did t	he lab ind	crease understa	anding	of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were	you provid	ded with adequa	ate bac	kground information	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were	necessary	materials avai	ilable	for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did t	he lab ins	structor provid	de assi	stance	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were	requiremer	nts for lab rep	ports c	learly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	J
														- 				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	1
0/1 1 0	Λ.	2 00 2 40	2	D 0														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 639

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	780/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.30
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	661/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.40
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	624/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.40
	_	ations reflect		1 5	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	807/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.20
				what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	2		1114/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.44
	_	-		o what you learned	0	1	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1145/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.44
. Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	909/1459	3.98	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.10
		was class canc			0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1260/1480	4.26	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.20
). How woul	ld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50
		tor seem inter			9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.80
				explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.40
		s contribute t		-	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.40
				our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1179			3.96	3.85	4.25
		Discus	sion															
L. Did clas	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	674/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.10
				d to participate	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	978/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.90
				d open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	860/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.10
		chniques succe			0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	358/ 788		4.03	4.00	3.80	4.13
		Labora	tory															
. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding c	f the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you	ı provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	***
. Were nec	cessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	****
		structor provid			8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
				early specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3										_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2		Gei	nera:	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								•						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					9						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102 Title

INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 640 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	Ο	1	2	2	7	4	3 69	1291/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	758/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	953/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	3	4	4		1298/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	2	4	3		1255/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	4	4		1039/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	961/1459	3.98	4.12	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	1		1349/1480	4.26	4.64	4.10	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	13	4		1089/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.77
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	1	5	3	4	3.77	1009/1430	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.91	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	1104/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1031/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	7	4	3.80	1145/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1204/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	760/1179	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.80
	_	-	-	_	_	-	_		,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	4	3	1	3.18	1100/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	3	6	1		1088/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	1	4	3		1076/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	650/ 788		4.03	4.00	3.80	3.40
1. Were special techniques successful	3	O	_	U	_	2	_	3.10	030/ 700	3.75	1.05	1.00	3.00	3.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	Ω	0	Λ	Λ	1	0	4 00	****/ 246	4 33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****
1. Did the lab increase anderstanding of the material	10	U	J	U	U		U	1.00	/ 210	1.33	1.20	1.20	5.55	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	1						

INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Title

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 641 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	4		1254/1481			4.29	4.14	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	1	6		1275/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	5		1046/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27		3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	3		1218/1424			4.21	4.06	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	5	1		1317/1396		4.07	3.98	3.89	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	5	3	3		1180/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	4			1272/1459		4.19	4.16	4.17	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8		1044/1480		4.64	4.68		4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	5	0	3	3.27	1301/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	2 62	1277/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	11		1107/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	2	5		1246/1399	4.00	4.77	4.09	4.23	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	_		1176/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	914/1179	3.90	3.94	3.96		3.46
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	۷	Τ.	4		4	5	3	3.40	914/11/9	3.31	3.94	3.90	3.03	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	829/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	809/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	967/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	640/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.43
1. Note special committee successful		Ü	_	Ū		_	_	3.13	010, .00	3.73	1.05	1.00	3.00	3.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****
Calf Darad														
Self Paced	1 -	^	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/	****	2 00	4 55	1 10	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51 ****/ 34	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15 15	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34 ****/ 24	****	4.50 4.50	4.83 4.82	4.67 4.58	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	TO	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 24		4.50	4.02	±.56	

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16

ENCE, ANNE M 4

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to 1	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Page 641

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 642 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1069/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	967/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	810/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	840/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	985/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	934/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	775/1459	3.98	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.26	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	702/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	559/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	963/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	753/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1081/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3			365/1179	3.97	3.94		3.85	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	944/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	708/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	984/1256		4.34	4.30	4.08	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	501/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	116/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	136/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	159/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	3	2		3.67			4.37	4.20	4.20	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	81/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	, -	****	4.50	4.83	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****
J. Were energy enough process for all the students	10	U	U	_	U	U	_	5.50	/ 44		1.50	1.02	T. JO	

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 642 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	4	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 643

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENES 110 0101

STATICS

28

ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

							Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	0	1	10	9	4.24	870/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.24
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	963/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.10
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	824/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.14
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	7	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1061/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.93
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	2	1	0	8	4	6	3.74	934/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.74
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	214/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.64
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	436/1459	4.39	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	702/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.90
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	2	2	10	3	3.67	1160/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.67
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were tl	he instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	3	0	0	2	1	5	11	4 32	990/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.32
		ctor seem inter			2	0	1	0	2	6	11		1238/1407		4.77	4.69	4.57	4.30
				xplained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	8	7		1096/1399		4.30	4.26	4.23	3.90
		es contribute t			2	0	1	1	3	7	8		1017/1400		4.35	4.27	4.19	4.00
				our understanding	3	1	1	0	4	4	9	4.11				3.96	3.85	4.11
		- ·																
1 541		Discus			0	0	2	1	^	2	-	2 71	007/1060	2 05	4 10	4 05	2 77	2 71
				what you learned	8	0	3	1	0	3	7		907/1262		4.18	4.05	3.77	3.71
				d to participate	8 9	0	4 4	1	1 2	5 3	3 4		1154/1259 1147/1256		4.40	4.29	4.06 4.08	3.14
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	9	9	1	0	2	0	1		****/ 788		4.34	4.30	3.80	3.∠3 ****
4. were s	peciai te	echniques succe	SSIUI		9	9	Τ	U	2	U	1	3.00	***/ /88	3.33	4.03	4.00	3.80	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 7				_				_	_	_				_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 5		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0											,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh .
				P 0							_		respons	es to k	e sign	nifican	it	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	_9						

?

0

Course-Section: ENES 110 0102 University of Maryland STATICS Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

29

Page 644 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1286/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.60
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	854/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.10
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	959/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	643/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.10
		_		what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	672/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.13
		g system clearl		ned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3		800/1459		4.19	4.16	4.17	4.22
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89			4.64	4.68	4.64	4.89
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1299/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.29
		Lectur	_	_														
		actor's lecture	_	-	1	0	0	1	2	2	4		1152/1409		4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	2	3	4		1268/1407		4.77	4.69	4.57	4.22
				plained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	2	2		1250/1399		4.30	4.26	4.23	3.44
		es contribute t	_		1	0	2	0	3	2			1287/1400		4.35	4.27		3.22
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	1	1	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	853/1179	3.96	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.63
		Discus																
				hat you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	708/1262		4.18	4.05	3.77	4.00
				to participate	2	0	1	2	3	1			1190/1259		4.40	4.29	4.06	2.88
				open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	1	2		1206/1256		4.34	4.30	4.08	2.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		2	5	1	0	0	1	Τ	3.33	671/ 788	3.33	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.33
		Labora	-							_								
		crease understa			9	0	0	0	0	1	0		,		4.26	4.20	3.93	****
_	-	_	_	round information r lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 249 ****/ 242		4.08	4.11	3.95 4.33	****
3. 11020 11	cocssary	mascrarb avar	10210 10		_	_	-	-		-	Ü	1.00	, 212		1.15		1.55	
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	ļ
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	;	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	;h
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					8						
				? 1														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: ENES 110 0103

STATICS

29

ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

Page 645 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

O L	a	Tl 1 +	0
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	822/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	742/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1459	4.39	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1160/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	2	4.75	417/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3		1107/1407	4.21	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	828/1399	3.65	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	591/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179		3.94	3.96	3.85	4.67
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1257/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	3.77	1.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1256/1259	2.74	4.40	4.29	4.06	1.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1238/1256	2.77	4.34	4.30	4.08	2.25
Freq	iencv	Dist	rib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: ENES 110 0104 University of Maryland Title STATICS

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 11

Page 646 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	818/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.2

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	818/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	726/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1138/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	801/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	542/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	413/1459	4.39	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	3	0	3.33	1285/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1019/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	1337/1407	4.21	4.77	4.69	4.57	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1325/1399	3.65	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1243/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	934/1179	3.96	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1146/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1120/1259	2.74	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1200/1256	2.77	4.34	4.30	4.08	2.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
Colf Daged															

2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****

Self Paced

Τ	. Did sell-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00 ^^^^/	55	^ ^ ^ ^	3.90	4.55	4.48	^ ^ ^ ^
2	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1.0	Ω	Ω	Ω	1	Ω	Ω	3 00 ****/	31	****	4 28	4 75	4 42	****

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

INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS

Title

Instructor: ONEILL, MARTIN

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 647 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	3		1286/1481		4.26	4.23	4.29	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	4		1071/1249		4.37	4.27	4.36	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	908/1424	4.10	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1368/1396	2.50	4.07	3.98	3.94	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	695/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	732/1459	4.30	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1014/1450	3.86	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407		4.77	4.69	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	,		4.30	4.26	4.29	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	985/1400		4.35	4.27	4.34	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	404/1179	4.30	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	570/1262		4.18	4.05	4.11	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75				4.30	4.28	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.98	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		4.24	4.44	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00			5.00	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	^ ^ * *

Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS

Instructor:

ONEILL, MARTIN

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 647 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to 1	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Title DYNAMICS Instructor:

WOOD, WILLIAM (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 648 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Rar	-	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera:	 1																
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	1174/1	1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.89
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	5	9	2	3.61	1280/1	1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.61
		uestions reflect			0	0	4	3	5	4	2	2.83	1210/1	1249	2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.83
		uations reflect			0	9	0	2	1	5	1	3.56	1258/1	1424	3.53	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.56
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ite to v	what you learned	0	9	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1114/1	1396	3.72	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.44
				what you learned	0	8	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1018/1	1342	3.60	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.70
	_	g system clearly	-	ned	0	0	2	3	2	8			1303/1		3.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.39
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0			5.00		1480		4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	2	2	5	3	1	2.92	1379/1	1450	3.01	4.10	4.09	4.15	2.92
		Lecture	2																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture:	s well p	prepared	1	0	1	0	8	4	4	3.59	1283/1	1409	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.59
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested ir	n the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	1176/1	1407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.21
3. Was 1	ecture mat	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	2	4	4	4	2	3.00	1325/1	1399	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.90
		es contribute to	_		1	0	3	4	6	2	2		1347/1		2.69	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.48
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	1	12	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1156/1	1179	2.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ite to v	what you learned	6	0	0	2	8	1	1	3.08	1136/1	1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.08
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	couraged	l to participate	6	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1123/1	1259	3.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.42
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1106/1	1256	3.42	4.34	4.30	4.28	3.50
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		6	10	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/	788	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	****
		Labora	orv																
2. Were	you provi		_	ground information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****
		Semina	r																
1. Were	assigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did p	resentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****
		Field W	Work																
1. Did f	ield expe	rience contribu		nat you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****
		y understand you			17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****
		Self 1	Dagod																
1. Did s	elf-paced			what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****
	_	tions make clear		_	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****
		acts with the in			17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was t	he feedba	ck/tutoring by p	proctors	s helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors for	r all th	ne students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	utior	ı										
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Туј	pe			Majors	.
00-27 28-55	0 3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 2 B 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Grad	duat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	в 8 С 4		Ger	neral	1				0	Unde	er-a	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0		001	u.	-				-	01140	g.		•	1,011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	####	# - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0							-	-	resp	pons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.5							

Title DYNAMICS

Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 649

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions	3		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran			_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
			, 																
		General																	
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	1	6	5	6		1174/1				4.29	4.40	3.89
		tor make clear			0	0	0	2	5	9	2		1280/1			4.26	4.23	4.29	3.61
	_	estions reflect			0	0	4	3	5	4	2		1210/1		2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.83
		ations reflect	_		0	9	0	2	1	5	1		1258/1		3.53	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.56
	_	_		hat you learned	0	9	0	2	2	4	1		1114/1		3.72	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.44
		-		what you learned		8	0 2	1	3	4	2		1018/1		3.60	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.70
		system clearly	_	nea	0	0	0	3 0	2	8	3	5.00	1303/1		3.45	4.19	4.16 4.68	4.17	3.39
		was class cance		ing effectiveness		0	1	0	2	0	18 1		1/1 ****/1		4.79	4.64		4.68	5.00
9. HOW V	would you g	rade the overal	i teach	ing effectiveness	14	U	1	U	2	U	1	3.00	~~~/1	450	3.01	4.10	4.09	4.15	2.92
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lectures	well p	repared	13	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1281/1	409	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.59
2. Did	the instruc	tor seem intere	sted in	the subject	13	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1296/1	407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.21
3. Was	lecture mat	erial presented	l and exp	plained clearly	13	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1357/1	399	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.90
4. Did	the lecture	s contribute to	what y	ou learned	13	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1389/1	400	2.69	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.48
1 Did.	alaga digan	Discuss		hat row laamad	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	2 00	1126/1	262	2 05	1 10	4 OE	1 11	2 00
				hat you learned to participate	6 6	0	0 2	2 1	8 2	4	1		1136/1 1123/1		3.05 3.38	4.18	4.05 4.29	4.11 4.34	3.08 3.42
		_	_	open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	2	3		1106/1		3.42	4.40	4.30	4.28	3.42
		chniques succes		open discussion	6	10	0	1	1	0	0		****/		2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	****
4. Weie	special te	ciniiques succes	ssiui		0	10	U			U	U	2.50	, , ,	700	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.90	
		Laborat	cory																
2. Were	you provid	ed with adequat	e backg	round information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****
		Seminar	•																
1 Were	accioned t			announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****
		ns contribute t			17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****
i. Dia j	presentatio.	iis concribace (o what	you icallica	Ι,	O	O	O	_	U	O	3.00	,	0,5		1.10	1.55	1.72	
		Field V	Jork																
1. Did :	field exper	ience contribut	e to wh	at you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	***
2. Did	you clearly	understand you	ır evalu	ation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****
1 544	16	Self I			1 7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/		****	2 00	4 55	1 11	****
	_	ions make clear		hat you learned	17 17	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/	55 31	****	3.90 4.28	4.55 4.75	4.44	****
		cts with the ir			17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	51	****	4.42	4.75	4.66	****
	_	k/tutoring by p		_	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	34	****	4.42	4.83	4.43	****
		gh proctors for			17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****
J. Were	ciicic ciiou	gii proceorb roi	. ull cir	c bedaeres	- /	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	J	Ü	3.00	,			1.50	1.02	3.00	
				Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
G.,		G GD3	Down and all Consider				ъ.										No		
Credits		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				e	asons	·				Тур	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Grad	uate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 8						-							-		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Gei	nera	1				0	Unde	r-gı	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	4
84-150		3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	6 6	D 0															
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	ıh		
				P 0								_	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	it	
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.5							
				? 1															

Course-Section: ENES 221 0102 University of Maryland Title DYNAMICS

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 650

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM Enrollment: 25 Questionna

maires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair							
	naires:	11	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire	4

				Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4				_	Instructor			Course	_						
		Question	.s 		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Ra 	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	928/	1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1397/	1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.18
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						3	3	2	1	2	2.64	1227/	1249	2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.64
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						3	1	0	1	3		1361/			4.27	4.21	4.28	3.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	3	3		1083/			4.07	3.98	3.94	3.50
		-		o what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	2	0		1269/			4.12	4.07	4.05	3.00
	-	g system clearl		ined	0	0	2	0	1	3	5		1117/			4.19	4.16	4.17	3.82
		was class canc grade the overa		hing effectiveness	2 1	1 0	1 1	0 1	0 5	1 2		4.38				4.64 4.10	4.68	4.68 4.15	4.38 3.10
	7																		
1 Wome	the inst	Lectur actor's lecture		propared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	/ J D	1001/	1400	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.30
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	1	2	5 7		1001/		4.45	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.30
				explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	2	2		1260/		3.15	4.77	4.09	4.78	3.40
		es contribute t			0	1	3	1	0	3		3.20				4.35	4.27		3.20
				our understanding	0	5	4	0	1	0	1		1156/		2.00	3.94	3.96		2.00
J. Did a	udiovisual	ceciniiques en	mance y	our understanding	U	5	7	U		U	_	2.00	1130/	11/2	2.00	3.94	3.90	4.05	2.00
		Discus			0	0													
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						3	1	4	1	2		1188/			4.18	4.05	4.11	2.82
				d to participate	0 2	0	1	2	4	1	3		1142/		3.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.27
	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	3	1	1	2	2		1195/		3.42	4.34	4.30	4.28	2.89
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssiul		0	8	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	781/	788	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	2.00
		Labora	_																
	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material				10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/		****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information					10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/		****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance					10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did t	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assis	tance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****
		Semina	r																
1. Were	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme			10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	***	
2. Was t	he instruc	ctor available	for ind	lividual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****
		Field	Work																
1. Did f	ield exper	rience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	59	***	3.92	4.30	4.67	***
	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	51	***	4.04	4.00	4.07	***
	3. Was the instructor available for consultation					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations					10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	41	***	3.68	4.26	4.69	***
5. Did c	onferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons								Туј	me			Majors	\$
	creates garned cum. GFA Expected Grades													- 					
00-27					Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gra	duat	e	0	Majo	or	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6		a		1				0	TTec 3			1	Mari		1
56-83	5 1	2.00-2.99	2	C 3 D 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Und	ler-g	raa l	.1	Non-	-major	1
84-150 Grad.	1 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	3 1	D 0 F 0		רק.	ectiv	700				0	###	#### - Means there are not en				ono	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	Τ.	P 0		ът(=CLT/	v E S				U						_	111
				I O		O+1	ner					responses to be significated				ııı udl	10		
I 0 Other																			

Course-Section: ENES 221 0103 University of Maryland Title DYNAMICS WOOD, WILLIAM

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 5

Page 651 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1		1069/1481		4.26	4.29	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	0		1394/1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	0		1212/1249	2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	959/1424	3.53		4.21	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1396	3.72	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	755/1342	3.60	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.00
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	1	2	2	0		1348/1459	3.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4		839/1480	4.79		4.68	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.01	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	0		1260/1399	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1356/1400	2.69	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	0	1	0		1156/1179	2.00				2.00
1									,					
Discussion				_					4000/4060			4 0=		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	0		1092/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	1		1127/1259	3.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	1		1025/1256	3.42		4.30	4.28	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	-	U	U	U	U	1	U	1.00	, 00		3.90	3.72	3.33	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****
	_	-	-	-	-	_	-	0	, 21					

Title DYNAMICS

Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 651 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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