

Course-Section: ENES 101 2
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 620
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	1	4	10	5	3.46	1412/1509	3.97	4.18	4.31	4.18	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	8	8	4	3.46	1388/1509	3.75	3.94	4.26	4.25	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	1	7	6	5	3.30	1212/1287	3.77	4.01	4.30	4.24	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	5	9	4	3.42	1339/1459	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.11	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	3	6	5	4	3.19	1301/1406	3.57	3.68	4.09	4.02	3.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	5	7	7	3.82	1009/1384	3.98	4.11	4.11	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	458/1489	4.24	4.25	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	524/1506	4.92	4.88	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	4	5	6	1	3.25	1338/1463	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.02	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	7	7	8	3.83	1288/1438	4.17	4.27	4.46	4.44	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	1275/1421	4.51	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	11	4	3	3.13	1350/1411	3.67	3.82	4.31	4.27	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	4	6	4	4	3.10	1341/1405	3.75	3.90	4.32	4.27	3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	847/1236	3.99	4.03	4.00	3.87	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	535/1260	4.21	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	740/1255	3.92	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	813/1258	3.96	4.08	4.38	4.18	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	442/ 873	3.78	3.96	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	162/ 184	3.72	3.61	4.16	4.06	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	123/ 198	3.93	3.82	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	****/ 184	3.71	3.76	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 177	4.14	3.79	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 165	4.29	3.99	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 89	****	3.81	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.88	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.14	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.04	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.01	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 48	****	3.84	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.70	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.68	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.42	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	3.21	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 41	****	3.58	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 46	****	3.40	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 37	****	3.29	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 30	****	3.43	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 2
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 620
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENES 101 3
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 621
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1214/1509	3.97	4.18	4.31	4.18	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	7	2	3.40	1404/1509	3.75	3.94	4.26	4.25	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	11	4	3	3.35	1200/1287	3.77	4.01	4.30	4.24	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	8	4	3.65	1244/1459	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.11	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	7	5	4	3.61	1134/1406	3.57	3.68	4.09	4.02	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	1083/1384	3.98	4.11	4.11	3.98	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	7	6	3.95	1058/1489	4.24	4.25	4.17	4.20	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.92	4.88	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	6	7	3	3.81	1052/1463	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	1188/1438	4.17	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	1246/1421	4.51	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	6	6	4	3.58	1262/1411	3.67	3.82	4.31	4.27	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	3	8	3.74	1197/1405	3.75	3.90	4.32	4.27	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	664/1236	3.99	4.03	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	637/1260	4.21	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	6	3	4	3.64	1090/1255	3.92	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	7	2	3	3.36	1180/1258	3.96	4.08	4.38	4.18	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	762/ 873	3.78	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	3.72	3.61	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	3.93	3.82	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	3.81	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	3.88	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.14	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.04	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.01	4.06	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 4
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 622
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	16	4.48	623/1509	3.97	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	774/1509	3.75	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	14	4.28	755/1287	3.77	4.01	4.30	4.24	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	8	10	4.04	951/1459	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	0	9	9	3.71	1082/1406	3.57	3.68	4.09	4.02	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	570/1384	3.98	4.11	4.11	3.98	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	11	10	4.24	781/1489	4.24	4.25	4.17	4.20	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	292/1506	4.92	4.88	4.67	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1021/1463	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.02	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	930/1438	4.17	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	950/1421	4.51	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	6	7	11	4.08	1010/1411	3.67	3.82	4.31	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	708/1405	3.75	3.90	4.32	4.27	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	4	5	12	4.00	664/1236	3.99	4.03	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	11	6	3.68	973/1260	4.21	4.20	4.14	3.95	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	4	3	4	11	3.64	1090/1255	3.92	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	6	5	10	3.80	1054/1258	3.96	4.08	4.38	4.18	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	550/ 873	3.78	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 184	3.72	3.61	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 198	3.93	3.82	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 184	3.71	3.76	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 177	4.14	3.79	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 165	4.29	3.99	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	3.81	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	3.88	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 90	****	4.14	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.04	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	4.01	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 48	****	3.84	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	3.70	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.68	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	3.42	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	3.21	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.58	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	3.40	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	3.29	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	3.43	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 4
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 622
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENES 101 5
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 623
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	6	10	4.04	1086/1509	3.97	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	3	10	3.83	1215/1509	3.75	3.94	4.26	4.25	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	10	4.13	863/1287	3.77	4.01	4.30	4.24	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	5	7	9	4.09	917/1459	3.80	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	6	3	10	3.78	1023/1406	3.57	3.68	4.09	4.02	3.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	756/1384	3.98	4.11	4.11	3.98	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	9	10	4.26	749/1489	4.24	4.25	4.17	4.20	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	662/1506	4.92	4.88	4.67	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	11	4	3.76	1092/1463	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.02	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	940/1438	4.17	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	991/1421	4.51	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	5	6	9	3.91	1145/1411	3.67	3.82	4.31	4.27	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	6	4	9	3.73	1200/1405	3.75	3.90	4.32	4.27	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	536/1236	3.99	4.03	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	370/1260	4.21	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	3	4	11	4.10	874/1255	3.92	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	721/1258	3.96	4.08	4.38	4.18	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	4	1	10	3.94	498/ 873	3.78	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	137/ 184	3.72	3.61	4.16	4.06	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	156/ 198	3.93	3.82	4.22	4.14	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	176/ 184	3.71	3.76	4.48	4.48	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	132/ 177	4.14	3.79	4.36	4.29	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	78/ 165	4.29	3.99	4.18	4.15	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 89	****	3.81	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 92	****	3.88	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 90	****	4.14	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.04	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.01	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.84	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 48	****	3.70	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 47	****	3.68	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 47	****	3.42	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	3.21	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 41	****	3.58	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 46	****	3.40	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.29	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	3.43	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 5
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 623
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101H 2
 Title Intro Engr Sci -Honors
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 624
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	9	17	4.45	673/1509	4.45	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	11	10	4.03	1064/1509	4.03	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	17	4.48	542/1287	4.48	4.01	4.30	4.24	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	12	14	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	389/1406	4.46	3.68	4.09	4.02	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	12	10	4.19	685/1384	4.19	4.11	4.11	3.98	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	6	16	4.28	738/1489	4.28	4.25	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	28	4.93	408/1506	4.93	4.88	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	13	3	3.78	1076/1463	3.78	3.81	4.09	4.02	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	6	5	16	4.17	1128/1438	4.17	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	1154/1421	4.52	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	11	10	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	3.82	4.31	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	12	10	4.07	1019/1405	4.07	3.90	4.32	4.27	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	4	8	12	4.24	504/1236	4.24	4.03	4.00	3.87	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	7	15	4.17	676/1260	4.17	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	7	8	11	3.96	939/1255	3.96	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	8	5	13	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.08	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	12	2	3	1	3	8	3.71	636/ 873	3.71	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 184	****	3.61	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	94/ 198	4.25	3.82	4.22	4.14	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 184	****	3.76	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 177	****	3.79	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 165	****	3.99	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 89	****	3.81	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	3.88	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.14	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.04	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 93	****	4.01	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	3.84	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.70	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.68	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	3.42	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	3.21	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	3.58	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	3.40	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.29	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	3.43	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: ENES 101H 2
 Title Intro Engr Sci -Honors
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 624
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 4
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 625
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	574/1509	4.11	4.18	4.31	4.18	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1086/1509	3.83	3.94	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	747/1287	4.01	4.01	4.30	4.24	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	602/1459	4.01	4.03	4.22	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	587/1406	3.65	3.68	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	579/1384	3.98	4.11	4.11	3.98	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	233/1489	4.38	4.25	4.17	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.90	4.88	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	853/1463	3.63	3.81	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	800/1438	4.25	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	950/1421	4.58	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1126/1411	3.56	3.82	4.31	4.27	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	974/1405	3.82	3.90	4.32	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	853/1236	3.76	4.03	4.00	3.87	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	396/1260	3.99	4.20	4.14	3.95	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	796/1255	3.75	3.99	4.33	4.15	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	598/1258	4.04	4.08	4.38	4.18	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	322/ 873	4.14	3.96	4.03	3.89	4.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	137/ 184	3.50	3.61	4.16	4.06	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	123/ 198	3.50	3.82	4.22	4.14	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	136/ 184	3.79	3.76	4.48	4.48	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	54/ 177	3.61	3.79	4.36	4.29	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	45/ 165	3.85	3.99	4.18	4.15	4.57
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	66/ 89	3.81	3.81	4.49	4.31	4.13
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	68/ 92	3.88	3.88	4.54	4.16	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	59/ 90	4.14	4.14	4.50	4.21	4.38
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	44/ 92	4.04	4.04	4.38	4.21	4.57
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	38/ 93	4.01	4.01	4.06	3.92	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	30/ 48	3.84	3.84	4.39	3.75	4.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	32/ 48	3.70	3.70	4.41	4.29	4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	28/ 47	3.68	3.68	4.51	4.53	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	28/ 47	3.42	3.42	4.18	4.26	4.13
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	37/ 44	3.21	3.21	4.32	4.12	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	27/ 49	3.78	3.78	4.26	4.28	4.13
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	18/ 41	3.58	3.58	4.14	4.13	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	30/ 46	3.40	3.40	4.31	4.52	4.13
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	24/ 37	3.29	3.29	4.05	4.47	4.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	16/ 30	3.43	3.43	4.27	4.21	4.00

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 4
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 625
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 5
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 626
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	7	5	3.70	1321/1509	4.11	4.18	4.31	4.18	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	6	6	3.65	1310/1509	3.83	3.94	4.26	4.25	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	3	2	2	9	3.72	1101/1287	4.01	4.01	4.30	4.24	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	1	2	6	6	3.61	1265/1459	4.01	4.03	4.22	4.11	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	7	2	3.05	1326/1406	3.65	3.68	4.09	4.02	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1107/1384	3.98	4.11	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	10	6	4.05	951/1489	4.38	4.25	4.17	4.20	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	682/1506	4.90	4.88	4.67	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	6	8	0	3.25	1338/1463	3.63	3.81	4.09	4.02	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	1203/1438	4.25	4.27	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	1	15	4.45	1195/1421	4.58	4.59	4.73	4.66	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	5	2	6	3.20	1341/1411	3.56	3.82	4.31	4.27	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	5	7	3.50	1265/1405	3.82	3.90	4.32	4.27	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	3	5	3	7	3.78	841/1236	3.76	4.03	4.00	3.87	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	8	4	3.45	1068/1260	3.99	4.20	4.14	3.95	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	1	6	6	3	3.26	1178/1255	3.75	3.99	4.33	4.15	3.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	4	8	4	3.55	1134/1258	4.04	4.08	4.38	4.18	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.14	3.96	4.03	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	177/ 184	3.50	3.61	4.16	4.06	3.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	3	3	1	1	3.00	193/ 198	3.50	3.82	4.22	4.14	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	179/ 184	3.79	3.76	4.48	4.48	3.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	174/ 177	3.61	3.79	4.36	4.29	2.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	158/ 165	3.85	3.99	4.18	4.15	3.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	83/ 89	3.81	3.81	4.49	4.31	3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	89/ 92	3.88	3.88	4.54	4.16	3.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	82/ 90	4.14	4.14	4.50	4.21	3.91
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	84/ 92	4.04	4.04	4.38	4.21	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	71/ 93	4.01	4.01	4.06	3.92	3.58
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	45/ 48	3.84	3.84	4.39	3.75	3.43
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	46/ 48	3.70	3.70	4.41	4.29	3.14
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	46/ 47	3.68	3.68	4.51	4.53	2.86
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	43/ 47	3.42	3.42	4.18	4.26	2.71
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	44/ 44	3.21	3.21	4.32	4.12	2.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	43/ 49	3.78	3.78	4.26	4.28	3.43
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	39/ 41	3.58	3.58	4.14	4.13	3.17
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	45/ 46	3.40	3.40	4.31	4.52	2.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	33/ 37	3.29	3.29	4.05	4.47	2.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	30/ 30	3.43	3.43	4.27	4.21	2.86

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 5
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 626
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 200 1
 Title Intro To Entrepreneurs
 Instructor: Rosenfeld,Micha
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 627
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	159/1509	4.90	4.18	4.31	4.34	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	201/1509	4.80	3.94	4.26	4.32	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	472/1287	4.55	4.01	4.30	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	291/1459	4.65	4.03	4.22	4.30	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	0	1	4	5	3.43	1225/1406	3.43	3.68	4.09	4.09	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.11	4.11	4.09	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	0	10	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.25	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	957/1506	4.65	4.88	4.67	4.61	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	131/1463	4.79	3.81	4.09	4.08	4.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.59	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	339/1411	4.72	3.82	4.31	4.37	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	0	14	4.50	634/1405	4.50	3.90	4.32	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.03	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	344/1260	4.62	4.20	4.14	4.19	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	333/1255	4.77	3.99	4.33	4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	409/1258	4.77	4.08	4.38	4.44	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	173/ 873	4.62	3.96	4.03	4.04	4.62
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.84	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.70	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	3.42	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	3.21	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.78	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.40	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			