Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A) Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 25

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 679 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	aia	,		Inat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Laval	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	5	12		1229/1639			4.27	4.08	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	8	11		1274/1639	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	8	10	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	6	12	4.08	953/1583		4.28	4.19	4.01	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	7	5	5		1357/1532	3.30	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	4	6	4		1340/1504		3.84	4.05	3.78	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	3	13		1016/1612		4.33	4.16	4.10	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 5	0	0	0 4	0 3	15 7			1235/1635		4.52	4.65	4.56 3.95	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Э	U	U	4	3	/	О	3./5	1170/1579	3.87	4.32	4.08	3.95	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	3	16	4.36	989/1518	4.42	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	0	5	17	4.36	1299/1520	4.47	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	7	8	3.68	1286/1517	3.74	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	8	9	3.76	1232/1550	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.17	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	413/1295	4.26	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	3	7	7	3 64	1052/1398	3.61	4.13	4.07	3.85	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	4	4	3	7		1286/1391	3.17	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	6	2	9		1095/1388			4.28		3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	3	0	2	5	5	3.60	682/ 958		4.02		3.71	
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	1	3		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	2	2	2		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	2	3		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	2	0	0	0	2		****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	1	2		****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	1	2		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	2	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	2		****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 21	***				

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor:

Enrollment:

SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 679 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

29 Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

University of Maryland ENGINEERING SCI Baltimore County

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Page 680 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				equer			_		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		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	2	2	4	5	12	3.92	1229/1639	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.08	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	8	11	3.88	1274/1639	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	8	10	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	6	12	4.08	953/1583	3.94	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	7	5	5	3.26	1357/1532	3.30	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	4	6	4	3.25	1340/1504	3.35	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	3	13	4.04	1016/1612	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1235/1635	4.28	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	691/1579	3.87	4.32	4.08	3.95	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	656/1518	4.42	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	0	1	6		1188/1520	4.47	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	1	2	1	4		1083/1517	3.74	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	3	3		1177/1550		4.34	4.22	4.17	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	265/1295	4.26	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	3	7	7		1052/1398	3.61	4.13	4.07	3.85	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	4	4	3	7		1286/1391	3.17	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	6	2	9		1095/1388		4.03	4.28	4.01	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	3	0	2	5	5	3.60	682/ 958	3.59	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 680 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 25

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	0						

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor:

Baltimore County SPENCE, ANNE M Fall 2007

Page 681 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 29

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	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	6	0	1	2	6	6	8		1339/1639	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.08	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	1	9	6	6	3.65	1416/1639	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	8	7	7	3.87	1112/1397	3.96	4.34	4.28	4.18	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	2	0	7	6	6	3.67	1324/1583	3.94	4.28	4.19	4.01	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	2	9	4	5	3.36	1317/1532	3.30	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	8	9	3	3.55	1188/1504	3.35	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	5	8	3.91	1175/1612	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.10	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	2	1	9	9	4.05	1479/1635	4.28	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1257/1579	3.87	4.32	4.08	3.95	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	1077/1518	4.42	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	1	17	4.55	1158/1520	4.47	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	8	2	8	3.55	1332/1517	3.74	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	1	7	3	9	3.86	1188/1550	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.17	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	677/1295	4.26	4.18	3.94	3.84	3.95
1000														
Discussion	11	0	0	1	_	_	_	2 56	1000/1200	2 61	4 12	4 07	2 05	2 56
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	5	5	5		1090/1398	3.61	4.13	4.07	3.85	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	5	0	6	3			1314/1391	3.17	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	6	3	4	4		1277/1388	3.57	4.03	4.28		3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	690/ 958	3.59	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	1 01	2 61	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28			-		-	-		, -	****		4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, 55		4.00	4.05	3.51	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	***	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 29

Baltimore County SPENCE, ANNE M Fall 2007

Page 681 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1		8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

INTRO ENGR SCI -HONORS

Title Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 26

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 682 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		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	6	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	754/1639	4.40	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	363/1583	4.62	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	918/1532	3.89	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	3	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	747/1504	4.13	3.84	4.05	3.78	4.13
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	7	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	532/1612	4.47	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	2	11	6		1382/1635		4.52	4.65	4.56	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	680/1579	4.23	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.23
Lecture	_	0	0	^	_	_	1 77	4 71	E00/1E10	4 71	4 60	4 42	4 20	4 71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2 1	17 20	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	-	-	0	0	9	20 9	4.95	273/1520	4.95	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2			4.24	907/1517	4.24	4.21	4.27	4.20	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1 0	1		4	13	4.29	875/1550	4.29	4.34	4.22	4.17	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	U	U	6	2	12	4.30	421/1295	4.30	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	316/1398	4.68	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	847/1391	4.21	3.95	4.30	4.07	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	998/1388	3.94	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	4.02	3.93		4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Combrass														
Seminar	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 82	***	****	4.50	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****		4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	****	$4.47 \\ 4.47$	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
3. Were criteria for grading made crear	24	U	U	U	U			4.50	/ 02			4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	***
· ·														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title INTRO ENGR SCI -HONORS

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 682 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad 2	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	oe sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO ENGINEERING SCI Fall 2007

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 683

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		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	1	3	6	17	4.44	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	14	5	3.74	1363/1639	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	946/1397	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	10	4.11	929/1583	4.13	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1035/1532	3.77	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	1	11	4	3.65	1123/1504	3.63	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	913/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	1257/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	830/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	Ο	1	2	9	13	4.36	989/1518	4 56	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	872/1520		4.79	4.70	4.61	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	7	6	9		1241/1517	4.02	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	897/1550		4.34	4.22	4.17	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	5	5	8	3.52	968/1295		4.18	3.94	3.84	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	695/1398		4.13	4.07	3.85	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	4	10	6		1168/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	11	6		1025/1388		4.03	4.28	4.01	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	650/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.69

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19	_			
				?	0						

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

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 27 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								eque		s			tructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.44
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	5	14	5	3.74	1363/1639	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.74
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	946/1397	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.07
	_	uations reflect		-	0	0	0	1	5	11	10	4.11	929/1583	4.13	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.11
				what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1035/1532		3.87	4.01	3.88	3.76
				o what you learned	2	5	2	2	1	11	4	3.65	1123/1504	3.63	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.65
		g system clearl			2	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	913/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.16
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	1	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	1257/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.38
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	18	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	806/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.16
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	20	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.56	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did th	e instru	instructor seem interested in the subject ture material presented and explained clear;					0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.82	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.87
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	20	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.93
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	20	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1550	4.30	4.34	4.22	4.17	4.25
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	20	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1295	3.78	4.18	3.94	3.84	3.52
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	695/1398	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.17
				d to participate	3	0	1	3	4	10	6	3.71	1168/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.71
				d open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	11	6	3.91	1025/1388	3.97	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.91
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	3	8	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	650/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.69
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	 2	A 11		Red	 quire		 วr M	aior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		1100	2411	Ju I	J 11	⊥∪ر ت	_	J	Graduat	_	0	1.100 ) (	<i>,</i> _	J
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 6		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 1		001	a.	_				-	011001 9	2		2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.1	ner				1	.9			5			
				? 0							_	-						

Page 684

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO ENGINEERING SCI Fall 2007

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 685

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		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	1	3	6	17	4.44	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	14	5	3.74	1363/1639	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	946/1397	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	10	4.11	929/1583	4.13	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1035/1532	3.77	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	1	11	4	3.65	1123/1504	3.63	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	913/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	1257/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	720/1518	4.56	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520		4.79	4.70	4.61	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	1	2	3		1083/1517	4.02	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	1	4		****/1550		4.34	4.22	4.17	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1295	3.78	4.18	3.94	3.84	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	695/1398	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	4	10	6		1168/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	11	6		1025/1388	3.97	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	650/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.69
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Tvi	pe			Maiors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 29

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 686 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	15	9		1014/1639		4.22	4.22	4.17	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	12	12	4.17	869/1397		4.34	4.28	4.18	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	14	10	4.17	871/1583		4.28	4.19	4.01	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	5	10	8	3.81			3.87	4.01	3.88	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	7	5	6	8		1171/1504		3.84	4.05	3.78	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	9	9	3.82	1237/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	14	13	4.48	1155/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	702/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	708/1518		4.62	4.43	4.38	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	20		1060/1520		4.79	4.70	4.61	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	10	14	4.28	864/1517		4.21	4.27	4.20	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	17	4.34			4.34	4.22	4.17	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	4	5	15	4.04	609/1295	3.78	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	560/1398	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	871/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	4	7	13	4.15	892/1388		4.03	4.28	4.01	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	3	10	8	4.04	448/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33			****	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI

Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 686 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS

Instructor: ROSENFELD, MICH

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 19

22

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 687 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain new	insights,ski		this course	0	0	1	1	2	8	7	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.00
_	-	or make clear			0	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	959/1639		4.22	4.22	4.27	4.16
		stions reflec	_	-	0	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	785/1397		4.34	4.28	4.39	4.26
	_	tions reflect	_	-	0	2	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	812/1583		4.28	4.19	4.28	4.24
				at you learned	0	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1012/1532	3.79	3.87	4.01	4.09	3.79
6. Did wr	itten assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	544/1504	4.33	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explain	ed	0	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	976/1612	4.11	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.11
8. How man	ny times w	as class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1215/1635	4.42	4.52	4.65	4.63	4.42
9. How wor	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1005/1579	3.93	4.32	4.08	4.14	3.93
		Lectur																
		tor's lecture	_	-	1	0	0	0	2	8	8		1021/1518		4.62	4.43	4.48	4.33
		or seem inter		-	1	0	0 1	0	1	3	14	4.72	943/1520		4.79	4.70	4.78	4.72
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	2	8	7	4.11	1016/1517		4.21	4.27	4.34	4.11
			_		2	0	2	0	3	6	6		1204/1550		4.34	4.22	4.33	3.82
5. Did au	diovisual	r understanding	1	2	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	917/1295	3.63	4.18	3.94	4.07	3.63		
		at you learned	10	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1398		4.13	4.07	4.14	4.44		
				to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	662/1391	4.44	3.95	4.30	4.35	4.44
				open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	702/1388		4.03	4.28	4.37	4.44
4. Were s	pecial tec	hniques succe	sstul		10	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	424/ 958	4.13	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.13
		Labora	-						_									****
		ease understa	_		18	0	0	0	1	0	0	5.00	****/ 224		5.00	4.10	4.33	****
_	_	_	_	ound information	18	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. were n	ecessary m	ateriais avai	lable for	lab activities	18	0	0	U	Τ	U	0	3.00	****/ 219	^^^		4.44	4.61	^ ^ ^ ^
1 514 61	-14	Field			1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	**** / FO	****	F 00	4 0 4	4 70	****
	_			t you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52 ****/ 53		5.00	4.04	4.78	****
_	_	understand yo or available		tion criteria	18 18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53 ****/ 42		4.00	4.05	4.28	****
		ould you disc			18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.75	****	****
	_	-	_	ld activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32		****	4.56	***	****
	F							ution	า									
Credits E	arnod	Expected Grades	_			Po:	asons				Ty	20			Majors			
CIECUTE F										, 			ту. 	 he			a JULS	
00-27 28-55	0 3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 15 B 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	1				6	Under-q	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		JCI	c. u.	-				~	onacı -g			14011		17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				9	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enona	h	
orau.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 P 0											-	respons				_	
				I O		Ot.1	ner					3	100,0110		91			
				? 0			-											

Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS

Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 48

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 688 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	39	4.79	281/1639	4.79	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	33	4.65	360/1639	4.65	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	11	33	4.60	427/1397	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.39	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	1	3	12	17	4.17	871/1583	4.17	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	11	13	13	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.87	4.01	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	15	1	2	3	3	21	4.37	521/1504	4.37	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	14	31	4.63	352/1612	4.63	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	0	44	4.93	463/1635	4.93	4.52	4.65	4.63	4.93
	10	1	0	0	1	7	29	4.76	175/1579	4.76	4.32	4.08	4.14	4.76
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	16	28	4.53	770/1518	4.53	4.62	4.43	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	43	4.91	491/1520	4.91	4.79	4.70	4.78	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	14	28	4.53	560/1517	4.53	4.21	4.27	4.34	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	7	35	4.69	435/1550	4.69	4.34		4.33	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	1	7	8	17	4.06	600/1295	4.06	4.18		4.07	4.06
5. Did dddiovibddi ceennigdeb ennance your anderbeanding	Ü	,	_	_	,	O		1.00	000/12/5	1.00	1.10	3.71	1.07	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	****/1398	****	4.13	4.07	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	1	1	0	1	4		****/1391	****	3.95	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	2	0	0	1	4		****/1388	****	4.03	4.28	4.37	****
4. Were special techniques successful	41	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	4.00	****
1. Were special commiques successful		Ü	O	Ü	0	_	Ü	1.00	, ,,		1.02	3.75	1.00	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate bachground information	- /	o	_	Ü	0	O	Ü	1.00	, 210				1.17	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****
J. Were erreerid for grading made orear	- /	o	O	Ü	0	O	_	3.00	, 02			1.10	1.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	0	Ο	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
1. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1,	O	O	U	_	O	O	3.00	, 31			1.50		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the seducites	1,	O	O	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 21			1.52	5.00	

Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS

Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON

Enrollment: 58
Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 688 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	39				
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0101 University of Maryland

MECHANICS OF MATERIALS Baltimore County

Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 689 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rar	_		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 			NA 													
		Genera																	
_	_	w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1		4.92	4.41		4.35	4.88
		tor make clear		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1		4.92	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.88
	_	estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00		L397	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.39	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1		4.75	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.63
				what you learned to what you learned	0	2 1	0	0	1	1 3	5 3	4.83	133/1 585/1		4.56 4.19	3.87 3.84	4.01 4.05	4.09 4.09	4.83 4.29
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	3 7	4.29	128/1		4.19	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.29
		was class canc		iiiled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1		4.92	4.52	4.65	4.63	4.88
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	,	L579	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.14	5.00
J. HOW WOO	ara you gi	rade the overa	II Ceac	iiing effectiveness		U	U	U	U	U	,	3.00	1/1	LJIJ	3.00	1.52	1.00	1.11	3.00
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1	L518	5.00	4.62	4.43	4.48	5.00
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1	L520	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1	L517	4.85	4.21	4.27	4.34	4.77
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1	L550	4.96	4.34	4.22	4.33	4.94
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	623/1	L295	4.56	4.18	3.94	4.07	4.33
	Discussion																		
1 Did ala	ace diecus	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/1	1308	4.33	4.13	4.07	4.14	4.33		
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	0	0	3	5.00		1391	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.35	5.00
				d open discussion	5 5	0 0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1		4.67	4.03	4.28	4.37	4.67
		chniques succe		a open albeabbion	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		958	5.00	4.02	3.93	4.00	5.00
-		-																	
		Labora	tory																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding c	of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.33	***
_	_	_		ground information	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	240	****	****	4.11	4.47	***
	_			or lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	****	4.44	4.61	****
		tructor provid			7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were re	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
		Field	Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper			hat you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/	52	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.78	5.00
	_			uation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	31/	53	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.28	4.00
_	_	tor available			6	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/	42	****	****	4.75	****	****
		could you disc			7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	37	****	****	4.58	****	***
	_	_	_	ield activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.56	****	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	1												
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Rec	าแร่ช		or Ma	iors		0	Grad	duate		0	Majc	 r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1000		_ ~	110		-	-	5140		-	-	.14.70	_	3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	L				0	Unde	er-gr	rad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									,					3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives							0	####	‡ – N	Means t	here a	re not	enou	jh
				P 0											es to b			_	
I 0							ner					5	-						
	? 0																		

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0101 University of Maryland

MECHANICS OF MATERIALS Baltimore County

Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS
Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 690 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean			
		General	 															
1. Did you	gain new	insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/163	9 4.92	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.88
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/163	9 4.92	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.88
3. Did the	exam que	stions reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/139	7 5.00	4.34	4.28	4.39	5.00
4. Did oth	er evalua	tions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1583	3 4.75	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.63
5. Did ass:	igned rea	dings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/153	2 4.56	3.87	4.01	4.09	4.83
6. Did wri	tten assi	gnments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	585/150	4.19	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.29
		system clearly	_	ned	0	0	0	0	0	1			128/161				4.21	4.88
	-	as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.88	706/163			4.65	4.63	4.88
9. How would	ld you gr	ade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/157	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.14	5.00
		Lecture																
		tor's lectures	_	_	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/151		4.62	4.43	4.48	5.00
		or seem intere		_	5 5	0 0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/152		4.79	4.70	4.78	5.00
	<ol> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearl</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>							0	0	1		4.67	405/151		4.21	4.27	4.34	4.77
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:							0	0	0		5.00	1/155			4.22		4.94
5. Did aud	iovisual	ur understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/129	4.56	4.18	3.94	4.07	4.33		
		hat you learned	5 5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/139			4.07	4.14	4.33		
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participat . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi							0	0	0		5.00	1/139		3.95	4.30	4.35	5.00
		_		open discussion	5 5	0 1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 5.00	496/138 1/ 95		4.03	4.28		4.67 5.00
4. were spe	eciai tec	hniques succes	SSLUL		Э	1	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	1/ 95	3 5.00	4.02	3.93	4.00	5.00
		Laborat	_															
		ease understar	_		7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 22		5.00	4.10	4.33	****
				round information	7 7	0	0	1	0	0 1	0		****/ 24		****	4.11	4.47	****
	_	ructor provide		r lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 21:		****	4.44	4.61 4.43	****
				ance arly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	•		****/ 19		****	4.18	4.43	***
J. Wele le	quilement	_		arry specifica	,	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	3.00	, 10			1.10	1.00	
		Field V					_	_										
				at you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 5:		5.00	4.04	4.78	5.00
				ation criteria	6 6	0 1	0	0	0	2		4.00	31/ 5:		4.00	4.05 4.75	4.28	4.00
		or available fould you discu			6 7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.00	****/ 4: ****/ 3'		****	4.75	****	****
				eld activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	-		****/ 3		****	4.56	****	****
5. Dia con	rerences	merp you carry	Out II	eid accivities	,	U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	/ 3.	2		4.50		
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1											
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				T	/pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	0	Gradua	 :e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 3						-						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-	grad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0		Means			_	jh
				P 0									respons	ses to 1	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0											5						
I 0 Other ? 0																		

#### Course-Section: ENES 220H 0102 University of Maryland Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS Baltimore County

Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON Fall 2007

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 691

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							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	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.92	4.22	4.22	4.27	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	4.56	3.87	4.01	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	4.19	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	4.92	4.33	4.16	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.92	4.52	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.14	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.62	4.43	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.85	4.21	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.96	4.34	4.22	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	4.56	4.18	3.94	4.07	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.33	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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	1	_			
				?	0						