

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 843
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	6	10	4.44	703/1674	4.44	4.05	4.27	4.32	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	578/1674	4.50	4.14	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	335/1423	4.69	4.16	4.27	4.36	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	466/1609	4.53	4.17	4.22	4.23	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	936/1585	3.88	3.60	3.96	3.91	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	8	5	3.82	1092/1535	3.82	4.02	4.08	4.03	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	10	4.17	966/1651	4.17	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	12	3	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	274/1656	4.64	4.01	4.07	4.10	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	560/1586	4.72	4.45	4.43	4.48	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	981/1585	4.72	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	635/1575	4.56	4.02	4.27	4.39	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	241/1380	4.60	3.82	3.94	4.03	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	443/1520	4.47	3.68	4.01	4.03	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	543/1515	4.60	3.85	4.24	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	358/1511	4.80	3.97	4.27	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	445/ 994	4.10	3.82	3.94	3.98	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	31/ 265	4.86	4.61	4.23	4.34	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	49/ 278	4.69	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	74/ 260	4.77	4.58	4.46	4.51	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	28/ 259	4.92	4.82	4.33	4.42	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	41/ 233	4.75	4.69	4.20	4.48	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 101	4.80	4.93	4.48	4.45	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	37/ 97	4.60	4.80	4.14	4.63	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 843
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101
 Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 844
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	0	0	1	4	9	20	4.41	751/1674	4.41	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	4	12	14	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	4	4	9	17	4.15	929/1423	4.15	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	825/1609	4.27	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	2	7	8	13	4.07	728/1585	4.07	3.60	3.96	3.95	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	11	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	548/1535	4.36	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	7	24	4.64	361/1651	4.64	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	359/1656	4.53	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	301/1586	4.85	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	170/1585	4.97	4.42	4.69	4.66	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	1	13	17	4.29	892/1582	4.29	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	8	19	4.32	895/1575	4.32	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	4	4	25	4.53	290/1380	4.53	3.82	3.94	4.01	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 7	C 8	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 37
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	32
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 845
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	2	2	3.67	1449/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1284/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	950/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1411/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1406/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1467/1651	3.39	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1412/1656	2.62	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	663/1586	4.13	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1472/1585	3.15	4.42	4.69	4.66	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1244/1582	2.95	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1487/1575	2.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	845/1380	3.35	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	810/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1341/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1333/1511	3.13	3.97	4.27	4.34	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	207/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	233/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.33	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.69	4.20	4.18	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 845
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 846
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	2	2	3.67	1449/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1284/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	950/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1411/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1406/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1467/1651	3.39	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1656	2.62	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1586	4.13	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1564/1585	3.15	4.42	4.69	4.66	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1582	2.95	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1575	2.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	666/1380	3.35	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	810/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1341/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1333/1511	3.13	3.97	4.27	4.34	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	207/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	233/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	215/ 260	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.33	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.69	4.20	4.18	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 846
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 303 0102
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 847
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	1	3	3	1	2.67	1656/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	2	3	2	2.83	1639/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1150/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	930/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1164/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1083/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1540/1651	3.39	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	1001/1673	4.67	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	3	2	3	1	0	2.22	1637/1656	2.62	4.01	4.07	4.07	2.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	1255/1586	4.13	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	5	2	1	3.00	1574/1585	3.15	4.42	4.69	4.66	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	1	0	3	2.64	1560/1582	2.95	4.09	4.26	4.26	2.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	1	1	2	2.45	1550/1575	2.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	2.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	3	0	3	3	3.18	1184/1380	3.35	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	2	2	1	2.75	1434/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	0	0	3	2	3.13	1409/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.13	3.97	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 303 0103
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 848
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	4	3	2	2	0	2.18	1668/1674	3.05	4.05	4.27	4.26	2.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	2	1	2.92	1630/1674	3.38	4.14	4.23	4.21	2.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1316/1423	3.84	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1557/1609	3.60	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	2	2	0	2.50	1543/1585	3.03	3.60	3.96	3.95	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1083/1535	3.52	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	1442/1651	3.39	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1103/1673	4.67	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	5	3	0	0	2.22	1637/1656	2.62	4.01	4.07	4.07	2.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	6	2	3.64	1451/1586	4.13	4.45	4.43	4.42	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	3	4	1	0	2.27	1584/1585	3.15	4.42	4.69	4.66	2.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	3	2	0	2.36	1573/1582	2.95	4.09	4.26	4.26	2.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	5	0	1	0	1.80	1571/1575	2.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	1.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	5	3	1	0	2.40	1338/1380	3.35	3.82	3.94	4.01	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	5	1	3.38	1234/1520	3.53	3.68	4.01	4.09	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1460/1515	3.17	3.85	4.24	4.32	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1470/1511	3.13	3.97	4.27	4.34	2.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 265	3.80	4.61	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 278	3.60	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	4.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.69	4.20	4.18	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 849
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	0	0	2	4	14	11	4.10	1123/1674	4.10	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	5	5	12	7	3.55	1479/1674	3.55	4.14	4.23	4.21	3.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	6	7	15	4.13	936/1423	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	1	4	12	11	4.07	1055/1609	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	4	5	6	3	4	2.91	1491/1585	2.91	3.60	3.96	3.95	2.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	4	8	9	3	3.36	1345/1535	3.36	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	4	7	9	9	3.61	1398/1651	3.61	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	778/1673	4.87	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	3	8	10	2	3.28	1462/1656	3.28	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	1	7	10	9	3.79	1403/1586	3.79	4.45	4.43	4.42	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	3	23	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.42	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	6	9	6	4	3.00	1504/1582	3.00	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	6	8	10	3.75	1289/1575	3.75	4.02	4.27	4.25	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	16	3	2	5	0	1	2.45	1331/1380	2.45	3.82	3.94	4.01	2.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	1	3	0	5	3.25	1284/1520	3.25	3.68	4.01	4.09	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1386/1515	3.23	3.85	4.24	4.32	3.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	3	2	1	3	4	3.23	1375/1511	3.23	3.97	4.27	4.34	3.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	8	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	3.67	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	3.20	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	3.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 34	Non-major 9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 28		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101
 Title FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 850
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	13	13	4.31	878/1674	4.31	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	12	13	4.24	943/1674	4.24	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	760/1423	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	1	5	8	9	3.73	1334/1609	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	3	4	5	7	3.70	1093/1585	3.70	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1256/1535	3.58	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	15	11	4.21	924/1651	4.21	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	11	17	4.61	1135/1673	4.61	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	4	13	6	3.81	1200/1656	3.81	4.01	4.07	4.07	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	3	20	4.56	1183/1585	4.56	4.42	4.69	4.66	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	13	10	4.11	1079/1582	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	13	11	4.14	1060/1575	4.14	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	11	5	5	3.52	1028/1380	3.52	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	27
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101
 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 851
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	8	4.54	570/1674	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	174/1423	4.85	4.16	4.27	4.27	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1029/1609	4.10	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1376/1585	3.22	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	832/1535	4.09	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	220/1651	4.77	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	324/1656	4.58	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	336/1586	4.83	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	737/1585	4.83	4.42	4.69	4.66	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	546/1582	4.58	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	806/1575	4.42	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1380	****	3.82	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.61	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.58	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.82	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.69	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.33	4.31	3.91	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Major 0
				P 0	Non-major 0
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 1
					Other 11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 852
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1196/1674	4.35	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	894/1674	4.19	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1131/1423	3.73	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	985/1609	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.42	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1066/1535	4.26	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1414/1651	3.89	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1015/1673	4.76	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	615/1656	4.48	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	301/1586	4.88	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1582	4.68	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	612/1575	4.59	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.68	4.01	4.09	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.85	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	93/ 265	4.69	4.61	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	130/ 278	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	137/ 260	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.58	4.82	4.33	4.33	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.18	4.50	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.33	4.31	3.91	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 853
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1196/1674	4.35	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	894/1674	4.19	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1131/1423	3.73	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	985/1609	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.42	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1066/1535	4.26	4.02	4.08	4.15	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1414/1651	3.89	4.14	4.18	4.16	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1015/1673	4.76	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.48	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.68	4.01	4.09	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	3.85	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	93/ 265	4.69	4.61	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	130/ 278	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	137/ 260	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	89/ 259	4.58	4.82	4.33	4.33	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.18	4.50	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 95	****	4.33	4.31	3.91	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	3.70	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 854
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	4.70	367/1674	4.35	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1077/1674	4.19	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1249/1423	3.73	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	930/1609	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.42	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.26	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	934/1651	3.89	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	887/1673	4.76	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	522/1656	4.48	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	214/1586	4.88	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1582	4.68	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1575	4.59	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.00	3.82	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	3.00	3.68	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	4.50	3.85	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1511	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 265	4.69	4.61	4.23	4.26	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	67/ 278	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	77/ 260	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	115/ 259	4.58	4.82	4.33	4.33	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.18	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 855
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	4.70	367/1674	4.35	4.05	4.27	4.26	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1077/1674	4.19	4.14	4.23	4.21	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	1249/1423	3.73	4.16	4.27	4.27	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	930/1609	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.27	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1329/1585	3.42	3.60	3.96	3.95	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	238/1535	4.26	4.02	4.08	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	934/1651	3.89	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	887/1673	4.76	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.48	4.01	4.07	4.07	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	4.88	4.45	4.43	4.42	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	4.68	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1575	4.59	4.02	4.27	4.25	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	3.00	3.68	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	4.50	3.85	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1511	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 265	4.69	4.61	4.23	4.26	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	67/ 278	4.48	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	77/ 260	4.63	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	115/ 259	4.58	4.82	4.33	4.33	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.18	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	9				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 856
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	28	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	207/1674	4.81	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	310/1423	4.72	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	3	4	7	5	3.48	1245/1585	3.48	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	223/1535	4.69	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	25	4.69	309/1651	4.69	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	19	12	4.34	1354/1673	4.34	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	178/1656	4.77	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	474/1586	4.77	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	397/1585	4.93	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	481/1582	4.63	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.02	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	213/1380	4.64	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	936/1520	3.89	3.68	4.01	4.18	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	987/1515	4.11	3.85	4.24	4.40	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1210/1511	3.78	3.97	4.27	4.45	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 32 Non-major 6
84-150	18	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 409 0101
 Title MECH: DEFORMABLE BODIE
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 857
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	7	5	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1068/1674	4.12	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	551/1423	4.53	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.53		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1266/1609	3.83	4.17	4.22	4.30	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1140/1535	3.77	4.02	4.08	4.18	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1276/1651	3.82	4.14	4.18	4.23	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	4	0	3.25	1474/1656	3.25	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	989/1586	4.41	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	1341/1585	4.35	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	3	7	3.94	1181/1582	3.94	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1284/1575	3.76	4.02	4.27	4.35	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	4	1	7	3.93	770/1380	3.93	3.82	3.94	4.04	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.86	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 858
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	3	4.33	854/1674	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1674	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1423	4.68	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1609	4.57	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	557/1585	4.25	3.60	3.96	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1535	4.01	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	393/1651	4.58	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.46	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	663/1586	4.68	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1071/1585	4.67	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	438/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	246/1575	4.43	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1470/1520	3.75	3.68	4.01	4.18	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.25	3.85	4.24	4.40	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	4.00	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 265	4.78	4.61	4.23	4.53	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.21	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	119/ 260	4.68	4.58	4.46	4.24	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 259	4.88	4.82	4.33	4.31	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	33/ 233	4.65	4.69	4.20	4.10	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 859
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	298/1674	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	161/1674	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.68	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	136/1609	4.57	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1585	4.25	3.60	3.96	4.01	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1342/1535	4.01	4.02	4.08	4.18	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	372/1651	4.58	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	292/1656	4.46	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.68	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	689/1585	4.67	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	932/1575	4.43	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	540/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	42/ 265	4.78	4.61	4.23	4.53	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.21	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	77/ 260	4.68	4.58	4.46	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	62/ 259	4.88	4.82	4.33	4.31	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	72/ 233	4.65	4.69	4.20	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 860
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.17	1056/1674	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1026/1674	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.68	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	963/1609	4.57	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	769/1585	4.25	3.60	3.96	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	767/1535	4.01	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	524/1651	4.58	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	955/1656	4.46	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	663/1586	4.68	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1225/1585	4.67	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	850/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1040/1575	4.43	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	666/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	3.75	3.68	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.25	3.85	4.24	4.40	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.45	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.82	3.94	4.19	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	4.78	4.61	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	4.68	4.58	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	4.88	4.82	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	4.65	4.69	4.20	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 861
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1480/1674	3.60	4.05	4.27	4.42	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1340/1674	3.80	4.14	4.23	4.31	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1004/1586	4.40	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1272/1582	3.80	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1380	4.50	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.68	4.01	4.18	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.85	4.24	4.40	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.97	4.27	4.45	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.21	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.33	4.31	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 862
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	5	4.50	607/1674	3.75	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	578/1674	4.25	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1107/1423	2.95	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	490/1609	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1223/1585	2.75	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.40	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	673/1651	4.20	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.50	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	381/1656	3.75	4.01	4.07	4.19	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	389/1586	3.90	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	615/1585	4.44	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	632/1582	4.25	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	819/1575	3.70	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	227/1380	3.81	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.61	4.23	4.53	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	150/ 278	4.25	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	77/ 260	4.75	4.58	4.46	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.31	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	72/ 233	4.50	4.69	4.20	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 863
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1628/1674	3.75	4.05	4.27	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.25	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1420/1423	2.95	4.16	4.27	4.34	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1572/1585	2.75	3.60	3.96	4.01	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.40	4.02	4.08	4.18	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.20	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.50	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.75	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.90	4.45	4.43	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1472/1585	4.44	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.25	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1487/1575	3.70	4.02	4.27	4.35	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.81	3.82	3.94	4.04	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 489C 0101
 Title MACROMECH OF COMPOSITE
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 864
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	12	10	3	3.37	1555/1674	3.37	4.05	4.27	4.42	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	7	14	4	3	2.97	1618/1674	2.97	4.14	4.23	4.31	2.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	8	9	7	6	3.37	1309/1423	3.37	4.16	4.27	4.34	3.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	1	3	8	3	2	3.12	1548/1609	3.12	4.17	4.22	4.30	3.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	2	11	5	2	3.14	1411/1585	3.14	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	6	3	1	2	2.92	1466/1535	2.92	4.02	4.08	4.18	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	3	5	8	5	3	3.00	1562/1651	3.00	4.14	4.18	4.23	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	14	15	4.52	1196/1673	4.52	4.71	4.69	4.67	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	3	1	10	7	0	3.00	1540/1656	3.00	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	9	11	4	3.54	1474/1586	3.54	4.45	4.43	4.46	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	6	9	12	4.14	1441/1585	4.14	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	6	14	3	3	2.96	1514/1582	2.96	4.09	4.26	4.31	2.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	9	7	5	3.29	1437/1575	3.29	4.02	4.27	4.35	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	2	3	3	0	2	2.70	1300/1380	2.70	3.82	3.94	4.04	2.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	12	Under-grad	28	Non-major	3
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101
 Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE
 Instructor: Mogavero, Marc
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 865
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1056/1674	4.17	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	270/1674	4.75	4.14	4.23	4.31	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	181/1423	4.83	4.16	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1121/1585	3.67	3.60	3.96	4.01	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.02	4.08	4.18	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.14	4.18	4.23	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1146/1656	3.88	4.01	4.07	4.19	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.45	4.43	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.42	4.69	4.76	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	850/1582	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.02	4.27	4.35	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	379/1380	4.40	3.82	3.94	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	****	3.68	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1515	****	3.85	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1511	****	3.97	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 600 0101
 Title ADV MECH ENGR DESIGN
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 866
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	4.44	703/1674	4.44	4.05	4.27	4.44	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	248/1674	4.78	4.14	4.23	4.34	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	238/1423	4.78	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1609	4.78	4.17	4.22	4.34	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	295/1585	4.56	3.60	3.96	4.23	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	238/1535	4.67	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	331/1656	4.57	4.01	4.07	4.15	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.88	4.45	4.43	4.50	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.42	4.69	4.79	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	180/1582	4.88	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1380	4.43	3.82	3.94	3.85	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1092/1520	3.67	3.68	4.01	4.19	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.85	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 265	****	4.61	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.58	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.82	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.69	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	3.75	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.93	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.33	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.00	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.33	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.83	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.17	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: ENME 600 0101
 Title ADV MECH ENGR DESIGN
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 866
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 610 0101
 Title SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 867
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	6	4.75	298/1674	4.75	4.05	4.27	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	433/1674	4.63	4.14	4.23	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.17	4.22	4.34	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	395/1585	4.43	3.60	3.96	4.23	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	268/1535	4.63	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.01	4.07	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.45	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	692/1575	4.50	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.82	3.94	3.85	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1027/1520	3.75	3.68	4.01	4.19	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1381/1515	3.25	3.85	4.24	4.47	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	896/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.61	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	259/ 278	3.00	4.34	4.19	4.42	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 260	****	4.58	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.82	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.69	4.20	4.53	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	102/ 103	2.50	3.75	4.41	4.56	2.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.93	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	89/ 95	3.00	4.33	4.31	4.43	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	****	5.00	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.80	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	60/ 76	3.00	4.00	3.98	4.20	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	46/ 77	3.67	4.33	3.93	4.31	3.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.64	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.35	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/ 49	4.67	4.83	4.27	4.46	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 61	4.67	4.17	4.09	4.46	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.67	4.26	4.59	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.84	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.64	5.00	

Course-Section: ENME 610 0101
 Title SYSTEMS OPTIMIZATION
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 867
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101
 Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 868
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	735/1674	4.43	4.05	4.27	4.44	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	176/1674	4.86	4.14	4.23	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	404/1423	4.64	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1609	4.85	4.17	4.22	4.34	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	369/1585	4.45	3.60	3.96	4.23	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	116/1535	4.85	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	583/1651	4.46	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	796/1673	4.86	4.71	4.69	4.78	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	437/1656	4.46	4.01	4.07	4.15	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.79	4.45	4.43	4.50	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.42	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	557/1582	4.57	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	5	7	4.21	992/1575	4.21	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	635/1380	4.08	3.82	3.94	3.85	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1116/1520	3.63	3.68	4.01	4.19	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1515	4.38	3.85	4.24	4.47	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	896/1511	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.82	3.94	4.07	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		6
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 664 0101
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 869
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	0	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	1296/1674	3.92	4.05	4.27	4.44	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	7	4	3.92	1246/1674	3.92	4.14	4.23	4.34	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	974/1423	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1484/1609	3.40	4.17	4.22	4.34	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	907/1585	3.91	3.60	3.96	4.23	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	832/1535	4.09	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	658/1651	4.42	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.71	4.69	4.78	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	5	3	2	3.45	1399/1656	3.45	4.01	4.07	4.15	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.45	4.43	4.50	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	1322/1585	4.38	4.42	4.69	4.79	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1250/1582	3.85	4.09	4.26	4.33	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	975/1575	4.23	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	998/1380	3.60	3.82	3.94	3.85	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	5	0	3.38	1234/1520	3.38	3.68	4.01	4.19	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	3.85	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1221/1511	3.75	3.97	4.27	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 994	****	3.82	3.94	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 7 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 8 Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	2 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 813F 0101
 Title MICRO FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 870
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1449/1674	3.67	4.05	4.27	4.44	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1421/1674	3.67	4.14	4.23	4.34	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.28	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.17	4.22	4.34	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	3.60	3.96	4.23	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.02	4.08	4.27	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.14	4.18	4.32	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1361/1673	4.33	4.71	4.69	4.78	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.01	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1442/1586	3.67	4.45	4.43	4.50	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1539/1585	3.67	4.42	4.69	4.79	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.09	4.26	4.33	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1329/1575	3.67	4.02	4.27	4.30	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	962/1380	3.67	3.82	3.94	3.85	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	572/1520	4.33	3.68	4.01	4.19	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1253/1515	3.67	3.85	4.24	4.47	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1511	4.33	3.97	4.27	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	676/ 994	3.67	3.82	3.94	4.07	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.61	4.23	4.51	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.42	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 259	5.00	4.82	4.33	4.66	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.69	4.20	4.53	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	3.75	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.93	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.33	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.80	4.14	4.26	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.00	3.98	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.33	3.93	4.31	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.64	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.12	4.35	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.83	4.27	4.46	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	43/ 61	3.67	4.17	4.09	4.46	3.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	27/ 52	4.33	4.67	4.26	4.59	4.33	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.64	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.84	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.64	5.00	

Course-Section: ENME 813F 0101
 Title MICRO FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 870
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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