```
Course Section: ENME 204  0101            University of Maryland                    Page  883
Title        INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C        Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SPENCE, ANNE M                Fall  2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 18                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  2  9  5  3.89 1300/1669  4.28  4.15  4.23 4.34  3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  7  4  7  4.00 1094/1666  4.17  4.03  4.19 4.29  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  2  1  4  5  6  3.67 1166/1421  3.83  4.13  4.24 4.35  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  3  2  9  4  3.78 1240/1617  4.06  4.00  4.15 4.24  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2 10  2  3  3.22 1373/1555  3.61  3.48  4.00 3.96  3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  1  3  5  3  4  3.38 1311/1543  3.98  3.81  4.06 4.10  3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  2  2  1  8  4  3.59 1361/1647  3.96  4.05  4.12 4.19  3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  7  7  3  3.76 1613/1668  4.17  4.76  4.67 4.59  3.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  0  0  8  2  4.20  759/1605  4.39  3.91  4.07 4.15  4.20

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  2  1  6  8  4.18 1130/1514  4.50  4.37  4.39 4.39  4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  2  3 11  4.56 1143/1551  4.78  4.45  4.66 4.72  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  5  3  7  4.00 1066/1503  4.50  3.98  4.24 4.29  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  1  3  8  3  3.69 1269/1506  4.30  4.02  4.26 4.33  3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  1  1  0  6  8  4.19  489/1311  4.59  3.64  3.85 3.96  4.19

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  3  2  1  7  3.92  934/1490  4.11  3.68  4.05 4.11  3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  1  2  1  4  5  3.77 1202/1502  4.33  3.74  4.26 4.31  3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  1  2  3  6  4.17  973/1489  4.48  3.79  4.29 4.36  4.17
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2  1  2  2  3  2  3.30  855/1006  4.01  3.72  4.00 3.99  3.30

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  12  0  1  0  2  3  0  3.17  208/ 226  4.08  4.18  4.20 4.42  3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0 1  1  1  3  4.00  146/ 233  4.50  4.18  4.19 4.36  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 1  1  0  4  4.17  170/ 225  4.58  4.43  4.50 4.74  4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           12  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   85/ 223  4.50  4.28  4.35 4.71  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  12 0  0  3  2  1  0  2.67  199/ 206  3.33  3.96  4.15 4.59  2.67

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 112  ****  ****  4.38 4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.36 4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.22 4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 105  ****  ****  4.20 4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  98  ****  ****  3.95 4.20  ****

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15  0  1  1  0  1  0  2.33 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22 4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15  0  1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       15  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39 5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   15  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97 5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15  1  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33 5.00  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34 4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    16  0  0  1  0  1  0  3.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31 5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      15  1  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45 5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       16  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25 5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     16  0  0  1  1  0  0  2.50 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34 5.00  ****
```

```
Course Section: ENME 204  0101                    University of Maryland                        Page  883
Title        INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C                Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SPENCE, ANNE M                        Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     27
Questionnaires: 18                           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned              Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                  Type                      Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99    1        A   11        Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major       15
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    5
 56-83      2       2.00-2.99    1        C    0        General              0      Under-grad  18      Non-major    3
 84-150     5       3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2        F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               17
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 204  0102                University of Maryland                                    Page  884
Title        INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C           Baltimore County                                       JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  SPENCE, ANNE M                   Fall  2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      16
Questionnaires: 12                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   4   8  4.67   389/1669  4.28  4.15  4.23  4.34  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   6   5  4.33   777/1666  4.17  4.03  4.19  4.29  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   1   0   1   6   4  4.00   969/1421  3.83  4.13  4.24  4.35  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   6   5  4.33   717/1617  4.06  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2   0   0   2   6   2  4.00   773/1555  3.61  3.48  4.00  3.96  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   5   7  4.58   316/1543  3.98  3.81  4.06  4.10  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   4   6  4.33   759/1647  3.96  4.05  4.12  4.19  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   5   7  4.58  1138/1668  4.17  4.76  4.67  4.59  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0   0   0   3   4  4.57   320/1605  4.39  3.91  4.07  4.15  4.57

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82   342/1514  4.50  4.37  4.39  4.39  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00     1/1551  4.78  4.45  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   0  12  5.00     1/1503  4.50  3.98  4.24  4.29  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1  11  4.92   147/1506  4.30  4.02  4.26  4.33  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0   0   0   0  11  5.00     1/1311  4.59  3.64  3.85  3.96  5.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   1   1   2   6  4.30   650/1490  4.11  3.68  4.05  4.11  4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90   237/1502  4.33  3.74  4.26  4.31  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0   0   0   2   8  4.80   378/1489  4.48  3.79  4.29  4.36  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   159/1006  4.01  3.72  4.00  3.99  4.71

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/ 226  4.08  4.18  4.20  4.42  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0  0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/ 233  4.50  4.18  4.19  4.36  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0  0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/ 225  4.58  4.43  4.50  4.74  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33   138/ 223  4.50  4.28  4.35  4.71  4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6   0   0   0   3   0   3  4.00   117/ 206  3.33  3.96  4.15  4.59  4.00

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 10 1  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  ****  4.38  4.59  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.36  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 1  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.22  4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    10   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  ****  4.20  4.63  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                10   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  98  ****  ****  3.95  4.20  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 10   0   1   0   0   0   1  3.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  5.00  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  5.00  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  5.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  5.00  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.67  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```

```
                                             Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA           Expected Grades              Reasons                  Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    1          0.00-0.99   0         A    7          Required for Majors  0       Graduate      0         Major       11
 28-55    0          1.00-1.99   0         B    3
 56-83    3          2.00-2.99   0         C    0          General              0       Under-grad   12         Non-major    1
 84-150   1          3.00-3.49   4         D    0
 Grad.    0          3.50-4.00   1         F    0          Electives            0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                       responses to be significant
                                           I    0          Other               10
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 301  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page  885
Title       STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER         Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   ZUPAN, MARC                      Fall  2006                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      85
Questionnaires: 62                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                      Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                        NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank       Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     1   0  0  0  0  7 54  4.89  143/1669   4.89  4.15   4.23 4.28  4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      1   0  0  0  0 20 41  4.67  345/1666   4.67  4.03   4.19 4.20  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1 23 37  4.59  475/1421   4.59  4.13   4.24 4.25  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      1  24  0  0  4  9 24  4.54  455/1617   4.54  4.00   4.15 4.22  4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1  18  1  0  9 14 19  4.16  644/1555   4.16  3.48   4.00 4.03  4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  20  1  0  9  9 22  4.24  669/1543   4.24  3.81   4.06 4.14  4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              2   0  0  0  1 13 46  4.75  213/1647   4.75  4.05   4.12 4.14  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                    2   0  0  0  0  0 60  5.00    1/1668   5.00  4.76   4.67 4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 2  1  0  0  8 36  4.73  182/1605   4.73  3.91   4.07 4.09  4.73


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          3   0  0  0  0  3 56  4.95  113/1514   4.95  4.37   4.39 4.46  4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     3   0  0  0  0  0 59  5.00    1/1551   5.00  4.45   4.66 4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  3   0  0  0  0 11 48  4.81  210/1503   4.81  3.98   4.24 4.28  4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       3   0  0  0  0  7 52  4.88  188/1506   4.88  4.02   4.26 4.30  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4   0  0  1  0 12 45  4.74  147/1311   4.74  3.64   3.85 3.97  4.74


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  49  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54 ****/1490   ****  3.68   4.05 4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  49  0  0  0  1  5  7  4.46 ****/1502   ****  3.74   4.26 4.28  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 49  0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46 ****/1489   ****  3.79   4.29 4.35  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                    47  9  0  0  1  2  3  4.33 ****/1006   ****  3.72   4.00 4.10  ****


               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 59 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 233   ****  4.18   4.19 4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 59  2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 225   ****  4.43   4.50 4.45  ****


               Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 59  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  97   ****  ****   4.36 4.12  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  60  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  98   ****  ****   3.95 4.15  ****


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   61  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  58   ****  ****   4.22 4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    60  0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/  52   ****  ****   4.06 3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation          60  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  39   ****  ****   4.39 3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      60  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  40   ****  ****   3.97 3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    61  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30   ****  ****   4.33 3.49  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   61  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  55   ****  ****   4.34 4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       61  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  42   ****  ****   4.31 4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         61  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46   ****  ****   4.45 4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          61  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33   ****  ****   4.25 3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        61  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29   ****  ****   4.34 4.13  ****
```

```
Course Section: ENME 301  0101              University of Maryland                    Page  885
Title          STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER        Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ZUPAN, MARC                   Fall   2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     85
Questionnaires: 62                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1        0.00-0.99   0       A   27      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major      56
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0       B   28
  56-83   16        2.00-2.99   8       C    1      General              0      Under-grad  62       Non-major   6
  84-150  20        3.00-3.49  15       D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00  18       F    0      Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               53
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 301H 0101            University of Maryland                    Page  886
Title        STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER        Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ZUPAN, MARC                   Fall  2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                             Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  102/1669  4.93  4.15  4.23  4.28  4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  8  5  4.29  841/1666  4.29  4.03  4.19  4.20  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  217/1421  4.80  4.13  4.24  4.25  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  6  7  4.43  612/1617  4.43  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  1  0  1  4  4  4.00  773/1555  4.00  3.48  4.00  4.03  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 6 6  4.29  628/1543  4.29  3.81  4.06  4.14  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   1  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  806/1647  4.31  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  926/1668  4.79  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 10  4.91   99/1605  4.91  3.91  4.07  4.09  4.91

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  392/1514  4.79  4.37  4.39  4.46  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.45  4.66  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  323/1503  4.71  3.98  4.24  4.28  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64  496/1506  4.64  4.02  4.26  4.30  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 6 8  4.57  232/1311  4.57  3.64  3.85  3.97  4.57

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  141/1490  4.90  3.68  4.05  4.11  4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  237/1502  4.90  3.74  4.26  4.28  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 1  8  4.70  500/1489  4.70  3.79  4.29  4.35  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   4  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  344/1006  4.33  3.72  4.00  4.10  4.33
```

<div align="center">Frequency Distribution</div>

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons            Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0       A   12      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     0      Major     14
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0       B    1                                Under-grad  14      Non-major  0
 56-83      5        2.00-2.99   2       C    1      General              1
 84-150     6        3.00-3.49   3       D    0                                #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   8       F    0      Electives            1           responses to be significant
                                         P    0
                                         I    0      Other               12
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 303  0101                University of Maryland                           Page  887
Title        TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT              Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ASSAKKAF, IBRAH                       Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     29
Questionnaires: 16                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  2  2  8  4  3.88 1307/1669  3.40  4.15  4.23  4.28  3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  4  9  2  3.87 1265/1666  3.62  4.03  4.19  4.20  3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1 10  5  4.25  814/1421  4.18  4.13  4.24  4.25  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  6  0  1  2  4  2  3.78 1240/1617  3.59  4.00  4.15  4.22  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4  1  1  2  5  3  3.67 1133/1555  3.37  3.48  4.00  4.03  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 0  1  4  5  4.40  516/1543  3.84  3.81  4.06  4.14  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  2  2  6  5  3.75 1275/1647  3.55  4.05  4.12  4.14  3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 3  4  6  0  3.23 1461/1605  3.13  3.91  4.07  4.09  3.23

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  3  6  7  4.25 1082/1514  4.20  4.37  4.39  4.46  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  2  1  3  5  5  3.63 1482/1551  3.34  4.45  4.66  4.70  3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  2  4  5  4  3.56 1312/1503  3.31  3.98  4.24  4.28  3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  5  1  1  4  5  3.19 1386/1506  2.82  4.02  4.26  4.30  3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 2 3  3  2  5  3.33 1027/1311  3.31  3.64  3.85  3.97  3.33

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 0  1  6  4  3.77 1029/1490  3.06  3.68  4.05  4.11  3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 3 1  2  3  4  3.31 1366/1502  3.05  3.74  4.26  4.28  3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 2 0  4  3  3  3.42 1314/1489  3.18  3.79  4.29  4.35  3.42
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  9  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/1006  4.00  3.72  4.00  4.10  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  0  2  1  1  1  2  3.00  212/ 226  3.08  4.18  4.20  4.17  3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 1 2  3  0  1  2.71  226/ 233  2.98  4.18  4.19  4.13  2.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 1 0 1  2  1  2  3.67  215/ 225  3.79  4.43  4.50  4.45  3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          10  0  1  1  0  2  2  3.50  200/ 223  3.79  4.28  4.35  4.27  3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  2  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   76/ 206  4.10  3.96  4.15  4.08  4.50

                                          Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0        A    9       Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major       16
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0        B    3
 56-83      2       2.00-2.99   1        C    3       General               0     Under-grad   16      Non-major    0
 84-150    10       3.00-3.49   6        D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   5        F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                15
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 303  0102                University of Maryland                               Page  888
Title        TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT             Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ASSAKKAF, IBRAH                       Fall  2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     30
Questionnaires: 21                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  3  4  6  5  3 3.05 1593/1669 3.40 4.15  4.23 4.28  3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0 10  7  4 3.71 1353/1666 3.62 4.03  4.19 4.20  3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  4  7 10 4.29  789/1421 4.18 4.13  4.24 4.25  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  5  1  2  4  6  3 3.50 1372/1617 3.59 4.00  4.15 4.22  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  7  3  3  2  3  2 2.85 1477/1555 3.37 3.48  4.00 4.03  2.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  5  0  2  5  3  5 3.73 1152/1543 3.84 3.81  4.06 4.14  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           3  0  2  1  4  6  5 3.61 1347/1647 3.55 4.05  4.12 4.14  3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2  1  0  0  0  0 18 5.00    1/1668 5.00 4.76  4.67 4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  1  2  3  8  3  2 3.00 1501/1605 3.13 3.91  4.07 4.09  3.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0 10 10 4.50  799/1514 4.20 4.37  4.39 4.46  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  1  5  4  5  5 3.40 1501/1551 3.34 4.45  4.66 4.70  3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  4  6  6  4 3.50 1330/1503 3.31 3.98  4.24 4.28  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  6  1  8  3  2 2.70 1441/1506 2.82 4.02  4.26 4.30  2.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  2  1  5  3  8 3.74  801/1311 3.31 3.64  3.85 3.97  3.74


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  4  2  0  0  2 2.25 1461/1490 3.06 3.68  4.05 4.11  2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  3  1  0  1  3 3.00 1395/1502 3.05 3.74  4.26 4.28  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  2  1  2  0  3 3.13 1388/1489 3.18 3.79  4.29 4.35  3.13
4. Were special techniques successful                 12  6  0  1  0  0  2 4.00 ****/1006 4.00 3.72  4.00 4.10  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9  0  2  2  3  2  3 3.17  208/ 226 3.08 4.18  4.20 4.17  3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9  0  3  1  1  4  3 3.25  215/ 233 2.98 4.18  4.19 4.13  3.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9  1  1  1  2  1  6 3.91  205/ 225 3.79 4.43  4.50 4.45  3.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9  0  1  1  1  2  7 4.08  160/ 223 3.79 4.28  4.35 4.27  4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  9  2  1  2  1  1  5 3.70  160/ 206 4.10 3.96  4.15 4.08  3.70


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    2        A    9      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major      16
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B    8                                                       
  56-83      7      2.00-2.99    2        C    2      General              0     Under-grad  21      Non-major   5
  84-150     8      3.00-3.49    3        D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    8        F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other               21
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course Section: ENME 303  0103                University of Maryland                              Page  889
Title        TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT                Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ASSAKKAF, IBRAH                         Fall  2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires:   7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   4   1   1  3.29 1555/1669  3.40  4.15  4.23  4.28  3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   4   1   1  3.29 1536/1666  3.62  4.03  4.19  4.20  3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   3   2  4.00  969/1421  4.18  4.13  4.24  4.25  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   0   3   0   1  3.50 1372/1617  3.59  4.00  4.15  4.22  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   2   0   0   3   1   1  3.60 1178/1555  3.37  3.48  4.00  4.03  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  2   0   1   2   1   1  3.40 1303/1543  3.84  3.81  4.06  4.14  3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   4   0   2  3.29 1492/1647  3.55  4.05  4.12  4.14  3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0   0   1   4   0   1  3.17 1480/1605  3.13  3.91  4.07  4.09  3.17


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   3   2   2  3.86 1288/1514  4.20  4.37  4.39  4.46  3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   1   1   3   1   1  3.00 1525/1551  3.34  4.45  4.66  4.70  3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0   2   0   3   1   1  2.86 1442/1503  3.31  3.98  4.24  4.28  2.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   3   0   2   1   1  2.57 1450/1506  2.82  4.02  4.26  4.30  2.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  0   2   1   1   2   1  2.86 1173/1311  3.31  3.64  3.85  3.97  2.86


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0   1   1   1   2   1  3.17 1299/1490  3.06  3.68  4.05  4.11  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0   2   0   2   1   1  2.83 1434/1502  3.05  3.74  4.26  4.28  2.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1  0   1   1   2   1   1  3.00 1398/1489  3.18  3.79  4.29  4.35  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   4   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  479/1006  4.00  3.72  4.00  4.10  4.00


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 226  3.08  4.18  4.20  4.17  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  6  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 233  2.98  4.18  4.19  4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  6  0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/ 225  3.79  4.43  4.50  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 223  3.79  4.28  4.35  4.27  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6  0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 206  4.10  3.96  4.15  4.08  ****


                              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       6
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    2
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    0      C    1      General              0    Under-grad  7      Non-major   1
 84-150     0      3.00-3.49    2      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                7
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 304  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  890
Title      MACHINE DESIGN                    Baltimore County                                JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    FARQUHAR, TONY                  Fall   2006                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 16                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  0  4  5  6  3.94 1253/1669  3.94  4.15  4.23  4.28  3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  1  0  3  6  5  3.93 1192/1666  3.93  4.03  4.19  4.20  3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1  0  5  3  7  3.94 1033/1421  3.94  4.13  4.24  4.25  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  2  1  1  5  3  3.50 1372/1617  3.50  4.00  4.15  4.22  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  1  1  4  2  2  3.30 1336/1555  3.30  3.48  4.00  4.03  3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 5 0 1 4  2  3  3.70 1175/1543  3.70  3.81  4.06  4.14  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  2  3  2  8  4.07 1012/1647  4.07  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 1 2  6  2  3.82 1164/1605  3.82  3.91  4.07  4.09  3.82


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  1  7  6  4.20 1118/1514  4.20  4.37  4.39  4.46  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  3 12  4.80  788/1551  4.80  4.45  4.66  4.70  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  1  1  4  5  4  3.67 1277/1503  3.67  3.98  4.24  4.28  3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  3  4  8  4.33  838/1506  4.33  4.02  4.26  4.30  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 10 1 0  3  1  0  2.80 1186/1311  2.80  3.64  3.85  3.97  2.80


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  1  0  1  1  5  4.13  793/1490  4.13  3.68  4.05  4.11  4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1  1  2  0  4  3.63 1270/1502  3.63  3.74  4.26  4.28  3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0  2  0  6  4.50  684/1489  4.50  3.79  4.29  4.35  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   3  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  307/1006  4.40  3.72  4.00  4.10  4.40


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 15 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.18  4.19  4.13  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 1 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.43  4.50  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 223  ****  4.28  4.35  4.27  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 112  ****  ****  4.38  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  97  ****  ****  4.36  4.12  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  92  ****  ****  4.22  4.47  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105  ****  ****  4.20  4.45  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98  ****  ****  3.95  4.15  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  4.29  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.59  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       14   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  3.82  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   14   0  1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  3.34  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  3.49  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      14   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  4.13  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     15   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  4.13  ****
```

```
Course Section: ENME 304  0101                    University of Maryland                          Page  890
Title        MACHINE DESIGN                          Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  FARQUHAR, TONY                          Fall   2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires:  16                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned            Cum. GPA          Expected Grades              Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0         A   10        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0       Major        10
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0         B    3
 56-83      3        2.00-2.99    2         C    1        General               0      Under-grad   16       Non-major     6
 84-150     4        3.00-3.49    2         D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3         F    1        Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                10
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 320  0101          University of Maryland                          Page  891
Title      FLUID MECHANICS               Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  BENNETT, DAWN                   Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    78
Questionnaires:  43              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  9 12 13  4  5  2.63 1635/1669  2.63  4.15  4.23  4.28  2.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  8 13 13  3  6  2.67 1623/1666  2.67  4.03  4.19  4.20  2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  4  5 11 15  8  3.42 1273/1421  3.42  4.13  4.24  4.25  3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  9  6 14  7  4  2.78 1572/1617  2.78  4.00  4.15  4.22  2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  19  1  3  8  2  8  3.59 1182/1555  3.59  3.48  4.00  4.03  3.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  8 11  7  5  7  4  2.59 1504/1543  2.59  3.81  4.06  4.14  2.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  6 14 12 10  3.56 1373/1647  3.56  4.05  4.12  4.14  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1  0  0  0  5 35  4.88  769/1668  4.88  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6  0 20 11  5  1  0  1.65 1600/1605  1.65  3.91  4.07  4.09  1.65


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0 13 12 12  4  2  2.30 1492/1514  2.30  4.37  4.39  4.46  2.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  4  8 12 10  9  3.28 1514/1551  3.28  4.45  4.66  4.70  3.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0 25  8  6  2  2  1.79 1498/1503  1.79  3.98  4.24  4.28  1.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0 23  8  8  2  2  1.88 1496/1506  1.88  4.02  4.26  4.30  1.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  6 15  6 12  2  2  2.19 1265/1311  2.19  3.64  3.85  3.97  2.19


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 34  0  4  1  2  0  2  2.44 ****/1490  ****  3.68  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 34  0  3  0  3  0  3  3.00 ****/1502  ****  3.74  4.26  4.28  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 34  0  2  0  4  1  2  3.11 ****/1489  ****  3.79  4.29  4.35  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  34   8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1006  ****  3.72  4.00  4.10  ****

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 40  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.18  4.19  4.13  ****


            Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    42   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****

                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1        0.00-0.99    0      A   30      Required for Majors  1      Graduate      0      Major       35
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0      B   10
 56-83    15        2.00-2.99    4      C    2      General              0      Under-grad   43      Non-major    8
 84-150   18        3.00-3.49   18      D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   13      F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other               40
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 321  0101                    University of Maryland                            Page  892
Title           TRANSFER PROCESSES                  Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:     MA, RONGHUI                         Fall   2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires: 14                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  1  3 10  4.64  419/1669  4.64  4.15  4.23  4.28  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  6  7  4.43  662/1666  4.43  4.03  4.19  4.20  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  331/1421  4.71  4.13  4.24  4.25  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  4  0  1  2  1  6  4.20  863/1617  4.20  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  2  0  0  3  5  4  4.08  721/1555  4.08  3.48  4.00  4.03  4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  1  3  4  6  4.07  850/1543  4.07  3.81  4.06  4.14  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  0  1  5  8  4.50  481/1647  4.50  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.68  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  1  8  5  4.29  654/1605  4.29  3.91  4.07  4.09  4.29

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  151/1514  4.93  4.37  4.39  4.46  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  954/1551  4.71  4.45  4.66  4.70  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  0  6  8  4.57  491/1503  4.57  3.98  4.24  4.28  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  407/1506  4.71  4.02  4.26  4.30  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  1  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  174/1311  4.69  3.64  3.85  3.97  4.69

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  9  0  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  742/1490  4.20  3.68  4.05  4.11  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  9  0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80 1179/1502  3.80  3.74  4.26  4.28  3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  8  0  0  0  3  1  2  3.83 1155/1489  3.83  3.79  4.29  4.35  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                 9  4  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/1006  ****  3.72  4.00  4.10  ****

              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.03  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.13  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     13  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  4.13  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99   1      A    3        Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major       14
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0      B    7
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99   4      C    2        General              0     Under-grad  14       Non-major    0
  84-150     6        3.00-3.49   2      D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   2      F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               12
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 332L 0101          University of Maryland                          Page  893
Title        SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB      Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  AROLA, DWAYNE D             Fall  2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  8                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies           Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88   151/1669  4.66  4.15  4.23  4.28  4.88
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   412/1666  4.43  4.03  4.19  4.20  4.63
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  3  2  3.88  1078/1421  4.00  4.13  4.24  4.25  3.88
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50   496/1617  4.57  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.50
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  0  1  1  1  1  3.50  1227/1555  3.25  3.48  4.00  4.03  3.50
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   130/1543  4.54  3.81  4.06  4.14  4.83
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57   401/1647  4.30  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.57
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  1144/1668  4.52  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.57
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  1  0  1  2  2  3.67  1274/1605  4.51  3.91  4.07  4.09  3.67

          Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   441/1514  4.66  4.37  4.39  4.46  4.75
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88   594/1551  4.92  4.45  4.66  4.70  4.88
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   277/1503  4.62  3.98  4.24  4.28  4.75
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   353/1506  4.77  4.02  4.26  4.30  4.75
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  1  1  1  0  4  3.71   812/1311  2.52  3.64  3.85  3.97  3.71

          Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1490  ****  3.68  4.05  4.11  ****
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1502  ****  3.74  4.26  4.28  ****
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/1489  ****  3.79  4.29  4.35  ****

          Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   2   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83    37/ 226  4.53  4.18  4.20  4.17  4.83
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83    40/ 233  4.69  4.18  4.19  4.13  4.83
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83    68/ 225  4.82  4.43  4.50  4.45  4.83
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            2   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83    55/ 223  4.69  4.28  4.35  4.27  4.83
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   2   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50    76/ 206  4.13  3.96  4.15  4.08  4.50

                                  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        5
  28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0      B    5
  56-83      0     2.00-2.99    1      C    3      General              0     Under-grad   8      Non-major    3
  84-150     1     3.00-3.49    1      D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    0      F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                8
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 332L 0102                University of Maryland                          Page  894
Title       SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB             Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    AROLA, DWAYNE D                 Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       8
Questionnaires:   3                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   816/1669  4.66  4.15  4.23  4.28  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33   777/1666  4.43  4.03  4.19  4.20  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   969/1421  4.00  4.13  4.24  4.25  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/1617  4.57  4.00  4.15  4.22  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   580/1543  4.54  3.81  4.06  4.14  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   759/1647  4.30  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  1068/1668  4.52  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1605  4.51  3.91  4.07  4.09  5.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  1022/1514  4.66  4.37  4.39  4.46  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00     1/1551  4.92  4.45  4.66  4.70  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   386/1503  4.62  3.98  4.24  4.28  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   471/1506  4.77  4.02  4.26  4.30  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  1296/1311  2.52  3.64  3.85  3.97  1.00


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   140/ 226  4.53  4.18  4.20  4.17  4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 233  4.69  4.18  4.19  4.13  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 225  4.82  4.43  4.50  4.45  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00     1/ 223  4.69  4.28  4.35  4.27  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00   117/ 206  4.13  3.96  4.15  4.08  4.00


                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENME 332L 0103            University of Maryland                          Page  895
Title        SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB       Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  AROLA, DWAYNE D              Fall  2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor     Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78   244/1669   4.66  4.15  4.23  4.28  4.78
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   2   5  4.33   777/1666   4.43  4.03  4.19  4.20  4.33
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   1   3   4  4.11   924/1421   4.00  4.13  4.24  4.25  4.11
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   0   1   1   6  4.22   831/1617   4.57  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.22
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4   1   1   1   1   1  3.00  1427/1555   3.25  3.48  4.00  4.03  3.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44   465/1543   4.54  3.81  4.06  4.14  4.44
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   0   1   3   4  4.00  1043/1647   4.30  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.00
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   6   3  4.33  1329/1668   4.52  4.76  4.67  4.68  4.33
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   119/1605   4.51  3.91  4.07  4.09  4.86

             Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   223/1514   4.66  4.37  4.39  4.46  4.89
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   567/1551   4.92  4.45  4.66  4.70  4.89
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  0  2  6  4.44   653/1503   4.62  3.98  4.24  4.28  4.44
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   8  4.89   188/1506   4.77  4.02  4.26  4.30  4.89
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  2  1  2  0  2  2.86  1173/1311   2.52  3.64  3.85  3.97  2.86

             Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1490   ****  3.68  4.05  4.11  ****
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1502   ****  3.74  4.26  4.28  ****
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  ****/1489   ****  3.79  4.29  4.35  ****

             Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  1   0   0   0   1   0   7  4.75    47/ 226   4.53  4.18  4.20  4.17  4.75
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1  0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25   114/ 233   4.69  4.18  4.19  4.13  4.25
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63   112/ 225   4.82  4.43  4.50  4.45  4.63
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1   0   1   0   0   2   5  4.25   146/ 223   4.69  4.28  4.35  4.27  4.25
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1   0   1   0   1   3   3  3.88   141/ 206   4.13  3.96  4.15  4.08  3.88

                                    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     Graduate       0     Major        9
 28-55       0       1.00-1.99    0      B    4
 56-83       0       2.00-2.99    0      C    2       General              0     Under-grad     9     Non-major    0
 84-150      5       3.00-3.49    4      D    0
 Grad.       0       3.50-4.00    5      F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                8
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 403  0101              University of Maryland                    Page  896
Title        AUTOMATIC CONTROLS             Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MAJID, ABDUL                   Fall   2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      57
Questionnaires: 27                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1   0  5  5  2  8  6  3.19 1577/1669  3.19  4.15  4.23 4.39  3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  4  1  6  9  6  3.46 1484/1666  3.46  4.03  4.19 4.22  3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  3  7  7  9  3.85 1095/1421  3.85  4.13  4.24 4.38  3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   7  3  5  2  6  3  3.05 1508/1617  3.05  4.00  4.15 4.22  3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  8  2  3  5  4  4  3.28 1350/1555  3.28  3.48  4.00 4.08  3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 12 2 2 4 3 3  3.21 1355/1543  3.21  3.81  4.06 4.18  3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  1  1  2  9 13  4.23  885/1647  4.23  4.05  4.12 4.14  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                 2   0  0  0  0  0 25  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67 4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 7 3 8 4 0  2.41 1568/1605  2.41  3.91  4.07 4.16  2.41


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  1  4  9  6  6  3.46 1396/1514  3.46  4.37  4.39 4.45  3.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  6  4  7  6  3  2.85 1545/1551  2.85  4.45  4.66 4.73  2.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 3 6 7 7 3  3.04 1421/1503  3.04  3.98  4.24 4.27  3.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  9  3  8  3  3  2.54 1454/1506  2.54  4.02  4.26 4.29  2.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 17 4 1 1 1 2  2.56 1220/1311  2.56  3.64  3.85 3.88  2.56


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 25 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/1490  ****  3.68  4.05 4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 25 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/1502  ****  3.74  4.26 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0 0 0 1 0 1  4.00 ****/1489  ****  3.79  4.29 4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 25   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1006  ****  3.72  4.00 4.21  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0      A   15       Required for Majors  0      Graduate      0      Major       23
   28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    6
   56-83      0      2.00-2.99    4      C    4       General              0      Under-grad   27      Non-major    4
   84-150    15      3.00-3.49   12      D    0
   Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    5      F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other               26
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 409  0101            University of Maryland                    Page  897
Title        MECH: DEFORMABLE BODIE        Baltimore County                         JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  KHAN, AKHTAR                  Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:   8                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course     0  0  0  0  1  1  6 4.63  448/1669  4.63 4.15  4.23 4.39  4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals      0  0  0  1  0  4  3 4.13 1019/1666  4.13 4.03  4.19 4.22  4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  1  2  2  3 3.88 1078/1421  3.88 4.13  4.24 4.38  3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals      0  4  0  1  1  0  2 3.75 1251/1617  3.75 4.00  4.15 4.22  3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  4  0  0  0  2  2 4.50  340/1555  4.50 3.48  4.00 4.08  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  1  1  2 4.25  659/1543  4.25 3.81  4.06 4.18  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained              0  2  1  1  1  1  2 3.33 1474/1647  3.33 4.05  4.12 4.14  3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                    0  0  0  0  0  1  7 4.88  769/1668  4.88 4.76  4.67 4.70  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  1  1  4  1 3.71 1241/1605  3.71 3.91  4.07 4.16  3.71


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared          1  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  274/1514  4.86 4.37  4.39 4.45  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject     1  0  0  0  0  0  7 5.00    1/1551  5.00 4.45  4.66 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  191/1503  4.83 3.98  4.24 4.27  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       2  0  0  0  1  1  4 4.50  642/1506  4.50 4.02  4.26 4.29  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4  1  0  1  1  0 2.67 1208/1311  2.67 3.64  3.85 3.88  2.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6  0  0  0  1  0  1 4.00  849/1490  4.00 3.68  4.05 4.26  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  0  0  0  0  2 5.00    1/1502  5.00 3.74  4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  1  1 4.50  684/1489  4.50 3.79  4.29 4.52  4.50


                                   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        7
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B   1
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99   1        C   0        General     4             Under-grad   8     Non-major    1
  84-150    4      3.00-3.49   3        D   0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   1        F   0        Electives   0             #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other       4
                                        ?   2
```

```
Course Section: ENME 412  0101                University of Maryland                               Page  898
Title      MECH DESIGN:MANUF/PROD             Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   AROLA, DWAYNE D                    Fall   2006                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires:  12                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75  269/1669   4.75  4.15  4.23  4.39  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58  461/1666   4.58  4.03  4.19  4.22  4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  3  6  4.17  886/1421   4.17  4.13  4.24  4.38  4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  0  1  0  4  6  4.36  684/1617   4.36  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  3  1  4  4.13  687/1555   4.13  3.48  4.00  4.08  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  1  2  4  4  4.00  895/1543   4.00  3.81  4.06  4.18  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  1  0  2  5  4  3.92 1149/1647   3.92  4.05  4.12  4.14  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  8  4  4.33 1329/1668   4.33  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  1  0  6  4  4.18  769/1605   4.18  3.91  4.07  4.16  4.18


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  584/1514   4.67  4.37  4.39  4.45  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1551   5.00  4.45  4.66  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  556/1503   4.50  3.98  4.24  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  471/1506   4.67  4.02  4.26  4.29  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  2  5  4  4.18  489/1311   4.18  3.64  3.85  3.88  4.18


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1490   ****  3.68  4.05  4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1502   ****  3.74  4.26  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1489   ****  3.79  4.29  4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   10 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1006   ****  3.72  4.00  4.21  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    7  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  131/ 226   4.20  4.18  4.20  4.61  4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  100/ 233   4.40  4.18  4.19  4.40  4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7  0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  139/ 225   4.40  4.43  4.50  4.39  4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             7  0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  151/ 223   4.20  4.28  4.35  4.56  4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   7  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40   93/ 206   4.40  3.96  4.15  4.20  4.40


              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  97   ****  ****  4.36  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  92   ****  ****  4.22  4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 105   ****  ****  4.20  4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  11 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  98   ****  ****  3.95  3.86  ****


                               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       10
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    2
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    1        C    1      General              7      Under-grad    12     Non-major    2
84-150     5       3.00-3.49    2        D    0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    4        F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                4
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course Section: ENME 432L 0101            University of Maryland                        Page 899
Title      FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB               Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ZHU, LIANG                      Fall   2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  8                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14 1052/1669  4.27 4.15  4.23 4.39  4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  841/1666  4.21 4.03  4.19 4.22  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   4  0  0  1  0  2  4.33  746/1421  4.19 4.13  4.24 4.38  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  2  3  1  3.57 1345/1617  4.22 4.00  4.15 4.22  3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   3  0  1  1  2  0  3.25 1359/1555  3.62 3.48  4.00 4.08  3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  1  0  1  3  2  0  3.17 1372/1543  3.59 3.81  4.06 4.18  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  1  1  0  5  4.29  828/1647  4.32 4.05  4.12 4.14  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1668  4.97 4.76  4.67 4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  654/1605  4.30 3.91  4.07 4.16  4.29


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  715/1514  4.74 4.37  4.39 4.45  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1551  4.88 4.45  4.66 4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  686/1503  4.22 3.98  4.24 4.27  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  744/1506  4.37 4.02  4.26 4.29  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0  0  1  1  1  4  4.14  513/1311  4.10 3.64  3.85 3.88  4.14


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  445/1490  4.50 3.68  4.05 4.26  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1502  5.00 3.74  4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 1398/1489  3.00 3.79  4.29 4.52  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   1  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1006  5.00 3.72  4.00 4.21  5.00


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4   0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   77/ 226  4.58 4.18  4.20 4.61  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   83/ 233  4.42 4.18  4.19 4.40  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/ 225  4.83 4.43  4.50 4.39  5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           4   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/ 223  4.83 4.28  4.35 4.56  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   47/ 206  4.29 3.96  4.15 4.20  4.75

                            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    Graduate     0     Major        6
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99  0        B   4                                                   
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99  0        C   0       General              0    Under-grad   8     Non-major    2
  84-150     3       3.00-3.49  2        D   0                                                   
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00  3        F   0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                7
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 432L 0102           University of Maryland                        Page  900
Title       FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB             Baltimore County                            JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ZHU, LIANG                  Fall   2006                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires:  6                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions           NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  590/1669  4.27  4.15  4.23  4.39  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  2 4.33  777/1666  4.21  4.03  4.19  4.22  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3  0  0  1  1  1 4.00  969/1421  4.19  4.13  4.24  4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/1617  4.22  4.00  4.15  4.22  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4  0  0  1  0  1 4.00  773/1555  3.62  3.48  4.00  4.08  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  0  0  2  2 3.80 1101/1543  3.59  3.81  4.06  4.18  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  1  4 4.50  481/1647  4.32  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0  5 5.00    1/1668  4.97  4.76  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  2  3 4.60  298/1605  4.30  3.91  4.07  4.16  4.60


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/1514  4.74  4.37  4.39  4.45  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  705/1551  4.88  4.45  4.66  4.73  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  556/1503  4.22  3.98  4.24  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  2  4 4.67  471/1506  4.37  4.02  4.26  4.29  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  0  0  0  2  3 4.60  219/1311  4.10  3.64  3.85  3.88  4.60


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 226  4.58  4.18  4.20  4.61  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 233  4.42  4.18  4.19  4.40  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 1 0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 225  4.83  4.43  4.50  4.39  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 223  4.83  4.28  4.35  4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5   0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 206  4.29  3.96  4.15  4.20  ****


                Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    5   0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****


                                    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      Graduate       0       Major        5
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0       B    3                                                           
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99    1       C    1        General              0      Under-grad     6       Non-major    1
  84-150    2        3.00-3.49    0       D    0                                                           
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    2       F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                5
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 432L 0103            University of Maryland                          Page  901
Title        FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB            Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   ZHU, LIANG                       Fall   2006                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires: 12                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  3  4  5  4.17 1026/1669  4.27  4.15  4.23 4.39  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  3  3  5  4.00 1094/1666  4.21  4.03  4.19 4.22  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  8  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  814/1421  4.19  4.13  4.24 4.38  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  1  0  0  5  4  4.10  970/1617  4.22  4.00  4.15 4.22  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  0  1  1  2  1  3.60 1178/1555  3.62  3.48  4.00 4.08  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  1  0  5  3  3.80 1101/1543  3.59  3.81  4.06 4.18  3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  0  1  4  6  4.17  948/1647  4.32  4.05  4.12 4.14  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  641/1668  4.97  4.76  4.67 4.70  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  1  0  0  2  7  2  4.00  918/1605  4.30  3.91  4.07 4.16  4.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  631/1514  4.74  4.37  4.39 4.45  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  760/1551  4.88  4.45  4.66 4.73  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  3  5  2  3.73 1250/1503  4.22  3.98  4.24 4.27  3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  1  0  0  3  5  3  4.00 1069/1506  4.37  4.02  4.26 4.29  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  0  6  1  2  3.56  914/1311  4.10  3.64  3.85 3.88  3.56

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 ****/1490  4.50  3.68  4.05 4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1502  5.00  3.74  4.26 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1489  3.00  3.79  4.29 4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1006  5.00  3.72  4.00 4.21  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   6  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   56/ 226  4.58  4.18  4.20 4.61  4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  105/ 233  4.42  4.18  4.19 4.40  4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  102/ 225  4.83  4.43  4.50 4.39  4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            6  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   85/ 223  4.83  4.28  4.35 4.56  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6  0  1  0  0  3  2  3.83  146/ 206  4.29  3.96  4.15 4.20  3.83

                                  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      11
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B    6                                                       
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   1       C    0        General              0    Under-grad   12      Non-major   1
 84-150     7       3.00-3.49   5       D    0                                                       
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   3       F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               12
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 444  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page  902
Title         MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI               Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   ASSAKKAF, IBRAH                           Fall  2006                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
Questionnaires:  11                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                       Frequencies           Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                        NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   3   0   4   3   1  2.91 1617/1669  2.72  4.15  4.23  4.39  2.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   2   6   3   0  3.09 1570/1666  2.97  4.03  4.19  4.22  3.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   6   1   2  3.27 1304/1421  3.06  4.13  4.24  4.38  3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   2   4   2   2  3.40 1425/1617  3.30  4.00  4.15  4.22  3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   2   1   3   1   0  2.43 1530/1555  2.81  3.48  4.00  4.08  2.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1   4   3   2   0  2.60 1502/1543  2.97  3.81  4.06  4.18  2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   3   2   3   3   0  2.55 1584/1647  2.43  4.05  4.12  4.14  2.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  713/1668  4.95  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1 0   0   6   4   0  3.40 1400/1605  3.06  3.91  4.07  4.16  3.40

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   3   4   4  4.09 1174/1514  4.01  4.37  4.39  4.45  4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   7   1   2  3.36 1505/1551  3.37  4.45  4.66  4.73  3.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   2   4   4   1  3.36 1374/1503  3.41  3.98  4.24  4.27  3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   3   2   4   0  2.73 1439/1506  2.67  4.02  4.26  4.29  2.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2 2   1   2   4   0  2.89 1165/1311  2.94  3.64  3.85  3.88  2.89

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   2   1   0   0   0  1.33 1489/1490  1.33  3.68  4.05  4.26  1.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0   1   1   1   0   0  2.00 1495/1502  2.00  3.74  4.26  4.46  2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  0   1   2   0   0  2.67 1454/1489  2.67  3.79  4.29  4.52  2.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   1   0   2   0   0   0  2.00 ****/1006  ****  3.72  4.00  4.21  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 226  ****  4.18  4.20  4.61  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.18  4.19  4.40  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.43  4.50  4.39  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          10   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 223  ****  4.28  4.35  4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 206  ****  3.96  4.15  4.20  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                    Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0         A    9          Required for Majors   0       Graduate      0        Major      11
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0         B    1
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0         C    0          General               0       Under-grad   11        Non-major   0
  84-150     8        3.00-3.49    1         D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    8         F    0          Electives             0       #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                         responses to be significant
                                             I    0          Other                10
                                             ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 444  0102                University of Maryland                         Page  903
Title       MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI            Baltimore County                              JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ASSAKKAF, IBRAH                   Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires: 13                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  2  3  7  1  0  2.54 1644/1669  2.72  4.15  4.23 4.39  2.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  1  3  6  3  0  2.85 1602/1666  2.97  4.03  4.19 4.22  2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  1  3  6  3  0  2.85 1384/1421  3.06  4.13  4.24 4.38  2.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   3  1  1  4  3  1  3.20 1487/1617  3.30  4.00  4.15 4.22  3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  0  2  1  1  1  3.20 1383/1555  2.81  3.48  4.00 4.08  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  1  2  3  0  3.33 1322/1543  2.97  3.81  4.06 4.18  3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  3  6  2  1  1  2.31 1601/1647  2.43  4.05  4.12 4.14  2.31
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1668  4.95  4.76  4.67 4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  1  3  5  2  0  2.73 1544/1605  3.06  3.91  4.07 4.16  2.73

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0  1  1  1  5  5  3.92 1255/1514  4.01  4.37  4.39 4.45  3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0  2  0  3  7  1  3.38 1503/1551  3.37  4.45  4.66 4.73  3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  0  6  4  2  3.46 1344/1503  3.41  3.98  4.24 4.27  3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0  4  1  4  4  0  2.62 1446/1506  2.67  4.02  4.26 4.29  2.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  3  0  4  4  1  3.00 1115/1311  2.94  3.64  3.85 3.88  3.00

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/1490  1.33  3.68  4.05 4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/1502  2.00  3.74  4.26 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/1489  2.67  3.79  4.29 4.52  ****

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 226  ****  4.18  4.20 4.61  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233  ****  4.18  4.19 4.40  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 225  ****  4.43  4.50 4.39  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          12  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 223  ****  4.28  4.35 4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 206  ****  3.96  4.15 4.20  ****

                                    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        10
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B    6                                                      Non-major     3
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   2      C    0       General               0    Under-grad   13
 84-150     6       3.00-3.49   8      D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   0      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                13
                                       ?    3
```

```
Course Section: ENME 475  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  904
Title      ROBOTICS                          Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TASCH, URI                         Fall   2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  11                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                     Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR NA 1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45  662/1669  4.45  4.15  4.23  4.39  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  7  4  4.36  740/1666  4.36  4.03  4.19  4.22  4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  620/1421  4.45  4.13  4.24  4.38  4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  0  1  2  2  4  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  6  2  2  0  1  0  2.00 1545/1555  2.00  3.48  4.00  4.08  2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  3  0  2  1  3  2  3.63 1215/1543  3.63  3.81  4.06  4.18  3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  2  4  4  4.00 1043/1647  4.00  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45 1232/1668  4.45  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2  0  0  0  2  5  2  4.00  918/1605  4.00  3.91  4.07  4.16  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45  877/1514  4.45  4.37  4.39  4.45  4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  760/1551  4.82  4.45  4.66  4.73  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  4  5  2  3.82 1205/1503  3.82  3.98  4.24  4.27  3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  509/1506  4.64  4.02  4.26  4.29  4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  0  0  1  2  0  8  4.36  365/1311  4.36  3.64  3.85  3.88  4.36


                              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    1       Major       11
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B    5
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99   1        C    1        General              3     Under-grad  10      Non-major    0
  84-150     6        3.00-3.49   6        D    0
  Grad.      1        3.50-4.00   4        F    0        Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                7
                                           ?    0
```

```
                                                 Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                      NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean      Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   816/1669  4.33  4.15  4.23  4.39  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  1094/1666  4.00  4.03  4.19  4.22  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   746/1421  4.33  4.13  4.24  4.38  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   323/1617  4.67  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   1   1   0   0  2.50  1521/1555  2.50  3.48  4.00  4.08  2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   1   0   1   0  3.00  1410/1543  3.00  3.81  4.06  4.18  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   302/1647  4.67  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0   2   1  4.33   591/1605  4.33  3.91  4.07  4.16  4.33

               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   584/1514  4.67  4.37  4.39  4.45  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1551  5.00  4.45  4.66  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   800/1503  4.33  3.98  4.24  4.27  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   838/1506  4.33  4.02  4.26  4.29  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   389/1311  4.33  3.64  3.85  3.88  4.33
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENME 482L 0102                University of Maryland                                    Page  906
Title        CONTROLS/VIB LAB                    Baltimore County                                    JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TASCH, URI                           Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  7                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   6   0  3.86 1320/1669  3.86  4.15  4.23  4.39  3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   5   0  3.71 1353/1666  3.71  4.03  4.19  4.22  3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   3   3   1  3.71 1148/1421  3.71  4.13  4.24  4.38  3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   2   3   1  3.57 1345/1617  3.57  4.00  4.15  4.22  3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 1427/1555  3.00  3.48  4.00  4.08  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   1   3   2  4.17  759/1543  4.17  3.81  4.06  4.18  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   4   2  4.14  962/1647  4.14  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   1   0   4   0  3.60 1312/1605  3.60  3.91  4.07  4.16  3.60

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   3   3  4.29 1064/1514  4.29  4.37  4.39  4.45  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43 1254/1551  4.43  4.45  4.66  4.73  4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   1   3   2  3.86 1189/1503  3.86  3.98  4.24  4.27  3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   1   0   5   1  3.86 1199/1506  3.86  4.02  4.26  4.29  3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   1   2   3   1  3.57  904/1311  3.57  3.64  3.85  3.88  3.57

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/1490  ****  3.68  4.05  4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0   1   0   0   1   0  2.50 1475/1502  2.50  3.74  4.26  4.46  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1489  ****  3.79  4.29  4.52  ****

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  1   0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33  116/ 226  4.33  4.18  4.20  4.61  4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0  1   0   2   2   1  3.33  212/ 233  3.33  4.18  4.19  4.40  3.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0  0   1   2   3   0  3.33  222/ 225  3.33  4.43  4.50  4.39  3.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1   0   1   2   0   3   0  2.83  217/ 223  2.83  4.28  4.35  4.56  2.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  1   0   0   1   0   4   1  3.83  146/ 206  3.83  3.96  4.15  4.20  3.83

                                    Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course Section: ENME 489C 0101          University of Maryland                         Page  907
Title        COMPOSITE MACROMECHANI       Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  FARQUHAR, TONY                   Fall  2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
         Questions              NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
         General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2  0  0  0  1  5  7  4.46   647/1669  4.46  4.15  4.23  4.39  4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  1  2  5  5  4.08  1054/1666  4.08  4.03  4.19  4.22  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  0  0  0  0  6  7  4.54   529/1421  4.54  4.13  4.24  4.38  4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  4  1  0  1  3  4  4.00  1029/1617  4.00  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  5  1  1  1  2  3  3.63  1163/1555  3.63  3.48  4.00  4.08  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 5  0  0  4  0  3  3.86  1060/1543  3.86  3.81  4.06  4.18  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  1  1  5  3  3  3.46  1411/1647  3.46  4.05  4.12  4.14  3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  1115/1668  4.62  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1  1  6  3  4.00   918/1605  4.00  3.91  4.07  4.16  4.00

         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  1052/1514  4.31  4.37  4.39  4.45  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77   862/1551  4.77  4.45  4.66  4.73  4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  2  4  6  4.15   969/1503  4.15  3.98  4.24  4.27  4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54   613/1506  4.54  4.02  4.26  4.29  4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 8  0  1  1  1  2  3.80   764/1311  3.80  3.64  3.85  3.88  3.80

         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0  0  1  2  2  4.20   742/1490  4.20  3.68  4.05  4.26  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0  0  2  1  2  4.00  1013/1502  4.00  3.74  4.26  4.46  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0  1  3  1  4.00  1038/1489  4.00  3.79  4.29  4.52  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  11  2  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  ****/1006  ****  3.72  4.00  4.21  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENME 489L 0101        University of Maryland                         Page  908
Title      ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE          Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   MOGAVERO, MARC                  Fall   2006                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires:  25                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  2  4 10  9  4.04 1145/1669  4.04  4.15  4.23  4.39  4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  5 10 10  4.20  957/1666  4.20  4.03  4.19  4.22  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  3 15  6  4.04  954/1421  4.04  4.13  4.24  4.38  4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  1  2 13  9  4.20  863/1617  4.20  4.00  4.15  4.22  4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  3  4 10  6  3.71 1104/1555  3.71  3.48  4.00  4.08  3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 2 10 6 1  2.83 1476/1543  2.83  3.81  4.06  4.18  2.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  5  8 11  4.25  862/1647  4.25  4.05  4.12  4.14  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  9 15  4.63 1106/1668  4.63  4.76  4.67  4.70  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0 0 6 9 4  3.89 1100/1605  3.89  3.91  4.07  4.16  3.89


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  1  4  9 11  4.20 1118/1514  4.20  4.37  4.39  4.45  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  2  3 20  4.72  954/1551  4.72  4.45  4.66  4.73  4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  6  9 10  4.16  959/1503  4.16  3.98  4.24  4.27  4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  2  5 10  8  3.96 1111/1506  3.96  4.02  4.26  4.29  3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 1 8 11 2  3.64  868/1311  3.64  3.64  3.85  3.88  3.64


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0  0  0  2  3  1  3.83 ****/1490  ****  3.68  4.05  4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83 ****/1502  ****  3.74  4.26  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 1 2 2 1  3.50 ****/1489  ****  3.79  4.29  4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   19 3  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/1006  ****  3.72  4.00  4.21  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   20       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major      25
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    4
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    4      C    0       General             13     Under-grad   25      Non-major   0
  84-150    13      3.00-3.49   12      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6      F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other               10
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 631  0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  909
Title          ADV. COND. & RADIATION             Baltimore County                                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ZHU, LIANG                         Fall   2006                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    9
Questionnaires: 8                            Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  0  0  7  4.50  590/1669  4.50  4.15  4.23  4.35  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  0  2  5  4.25  881/1666  4.25  4.03  4.19  4.19  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  280/1421  4.75  4.13  4.24  4.33  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  323/1617  4.67  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   3  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 1062/1555  3.75  3.48  4.00  4.07  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  142/1543  4.80  3.81  4.06  4.27  4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   1  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  302/1647  4.67  4.05  4.12  4.15  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  1  0  0  0  7  4.50  373/1605  4.50  3.91  4.07  4.13  4.50

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  1  0  0  0  7  4.50  799/1514  4.50  4.37  4.39  4.37  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  1  0  0  0  7  4.50 1193/1551  4.50  4.45  4.66  4.72  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  0  0  1  5  4.29  852/1503  4.29  3.98  4.24  4.22  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  0  0  0  7  4.50  642/1506  4.50  4.02  4.26  4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  116/1311  4.80  3.64  3.85  3.89  4.80

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  2  0  1  2  1  3.00 1328/1490  3.00  3.68  4.05  4.18  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  2  0  2  1  1  2.83 1434/1502  2.83  3.74  4.26  4.46  2.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  2  0  1  1  2  3.17 1379/1489  3.17  3.79  4.29  4.44  3.17
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   4  1  0  0  1  0  2.50  967/1006  2.50  3.72  4.00  4.11  2.50

             Field Work
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  4.90  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  4.31  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  4.55  ****

             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  4.45  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  4.40  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  4.60  ****

                                      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      4       Major        8
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    3                                                        
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0      C    0       General               0    Under-grad    4       Non-major    0
  84-150     0       3.00-3.49    2      D    0                                                        
  Grad.      4       3.50-4.00    0      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 7
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 645  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  910
Title        APPL COMP THERMO/FLUID             Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   MA, RONGHUI                         Fall  2006                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
Questionnaires:  4                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  269/1669  4.75  4.15  4.23  4.35  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  549/1666  4.50  4.03  4.19  4.19  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  814/1421  4.25  4.13  4.24  4.33  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  323/1617  4.67  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  773/1555  4.00  3.48  4.00  4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  659/1543  4.25  3.81  4.06  4.27  4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  1  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 1043/1647  4.00  4.05  4.12  4.15  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 1190/1668  4.50  4.76  4.67  4.83  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  690/1605  4.25  3.91  4.07  4.13  4.25

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  799/1514  4.50  4.37  4.39  4.37  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 1338/1551  4.25  4.45  4.66  4.72  4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 1066/1503  4.00  3.98  4.24  4.22  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  642/1506  4.50  4.02  4.26  4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.64  3.85  3.89  4.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  692/1490  4.25  3.68  4.05  4.18  4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  0  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  393/1502  4.75  3.74  4.26  4.46  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  0  0  0  0  0  3  1  4.25  920/1489  4.25  3.79  4.29  4.44  4.25
4. Were special techniques successful                 0  2  0  1  1  0  0  2.50  967/1006  2.50  3.72  4.00  4.11  2.50

              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   77/ 226  4.50  4.18  4.20  4.47  4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  2  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   83/ 233  4.50  4.18  4.19  4.41  4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  2  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  127/ 225  4.50  4.43  4.50  4.65  4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          2  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  164/ 223  4.00  4.28  4.35  4.48  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  2  0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  169/ 206  3.50  3.96  4.15  4.39  3.50

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

```
Course Section: ENME 664  0101            University of Maryland                          Page  911
Title      DYNAMICS                           Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    ZHU, WEIDONG                       Fall   2006                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     12
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   1   1   1   6  4.33   816/1669  4.33   4.15  4.23  4.35  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   3   4  4.22   922/1666  4.22   4.03  4.19  4.19  4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   0   1   7  4.56   511/1421  4.56   4.13  4.24  4.33  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   1   1   1   5  4.25   801/1617  4.25   4.00  4.15  4.24  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   2   1   3   0   1   2  3.00  1427/1555  3.00   3.48  4.00  4.07  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   2   1   0   0   3   3  4.00   895/1543  4.00   3.81  4.06  4.27  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   2   5  4.22   896/1647  4.22   4.05  4.12  4.15  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   6   2  4.25  1382/1668  4.25   4.76  4.67  4.83  4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2   1   0   1   1   2   2  3.83  1148/1605  3.83   3.91  4.07  4.13  3.83


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   2   0   6  4.22  1100/1514  4.22   4.37  4.39  4.37  4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   1   0   7  4.44  1239/1551  4.44   4.45  4.66  4.72  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   1   1   2   3   2  3.44  1351/1503  3.44   3.98  4.24  4.22  3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   0   2   1   5  4.00  1069/1506  4.00   4.02  4.26  4.24  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0   3   1   1   1   1   2  3.33  1027/1311  3.33   3.64  3.85  3.89  3.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0   2   1   1   2   2  3.13  1311/1490  3.13   3.68  4.05  4.18  3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0   1   0   4   1   2  3.38  1346/1502  3.38   3.74  4.26  4.46  3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1   0   1   1   3   0   3  3.38  1328/1489  3.38   3.79  4.29  4.44  3.38
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   4   1   1   1   1   0  2.50   967/1006  2.50   3.72  4.00  4.11  2.50

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/ 233  ****   4.18  4.19  4.41  ****


                 Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  8   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/  52  ****   ****  4.06  4.57  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENME 670  0101              University of Maryland                         Page  912
Title      CONTINUUM MECHANICS             Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   ERDEM, ALI U                   Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires:  8                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0   0   2   1   1   3  3.71 1387/1669  3.71  4.15  4.23  4.35  3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   2   2   1   2  3.13 1565/1666  3.13  4.03  4.19  4.19  3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   3   1   3  3.75 1135/1421  3.75  4.13  4.24  4.33  3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   2   1   1   0   1  2.40 1599/1617  2.40  4.00  4.15  4.24  2.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2   1   0   2   1   1  3.20 1383/1555  3.20  3.48  4.00  4.07  3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  1   0   1   3   0  3.20 1358/1543  3.20  3.81  4.06  4.27  3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   2   1   2   2  3.57 1365/1647  3.57  4.05  4.12  4.15  3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  2   0   2   1   1  2.83 1535/1605  2.83  3.91  4.07  4.13  2.83


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   1   2   3   2  3.75 1324/1514  3.75  4.37  4.39  4.37  3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63 1083/1551  4.63  4.45  4.66  4.72  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   2   0   3   2  3.38 1372/1503  3.38  3.98  4.24  4.22  3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   2   2   1   3  3.63 1292/1506  3.63  4.02  4.26  4.24  3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 5  1   0   1   0   0  2.00 1269/1311  2.00  3.64  3.85  3.89  2.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   2   0   0   2   0  2.50 1431/1490  2.50  3.68  4.05  4.18  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   2   0   1   0   1  2.50 1475/1502  2.50  3.74  4.26  4.46  2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  1   0   2   1   0  2.75 1441/1489  2.75  3.79  4.29  4.44  2.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   3   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/1006  ****  3.72  4.00  4.11  ****

            Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 223  ****  4.28  4.35  4.48  ****

                                   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     Graduate      3     Major       6
 28-55      0         1.00-1.99   0      B   2                                                      
 56-83      0         2.00-2.99   0      C   1      General               1     Under-grad    5     Non-major   2
 84-150     0         3.00-3.49   1      D   0
 Grad.      3         3.50-4.00   2      F   0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I   0      Other                 6
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course Section: ENME 811M 0101          University of Maryland                              Page  913
Title    MECHATRONICS SYSTEM DS          Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  ANJANAPPA, MUNI             Fall  2006                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires:  7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.15	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	293/1666	4.71	4.03	4.19	4.19	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	493/1421	4.57	4.13	4.24	4.33	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.00	4.15	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.48	4.00	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	490/1543	4.43	3.81	4.06	4.27	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	401/1647	4.57	4.05	4.12	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.76	4.67	4.83	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.80	3.91	4.07	4.13	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	715/1514	4.57	4.37	4.39	4.37	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.45	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	686/1503	4.43	3.98	4.24	4.22	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	407/1506	4.71	4.02	4.26	4.24	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	319/1311	4.43	3.64	3.85	3.89	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.68	4.05	4.18	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.74	4.26	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	3.79	4.29	4.44	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.72	4.00	4.11	4.00

```
                                         Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: ENME 812R 0101            University of Maryland                          Page  914
Title       ROBOT MANIPULATORS                Baltimore County                          JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  TASCH, URI                         Fall   2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     2
Questionnaires:  2                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1669  5.00  4.15  4.23  4.35  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  549/1666  4.50  4.03  4.19  4.19  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  557/1421  4.50  4.13  4.24  4.33  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.00  4.15  4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1427/1555  3.00  3.48  4.00  4.07  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1410/1543  3.00  3.81  4.06  4.27  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1647  5.00  4.05  4.12  4.15  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.76  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0   0   1   0   1  4.00  918/1605  4.00  3.91  4.07  4.13  4.00


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50  799/1514  4.50  4.37  4.39  4.37  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1404/1551  4.00  4.45  4.66  4.72  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 1423/1503  3.00  3.98  4.24  4.22  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 1319/1506  3.50  4.02  4.26  4.24  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0   0   1   1   0  3.50  939/1311  3.50  3.64  3.85  3.89  3.50


                                         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     Graduate      0        Major       1
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B    0                                                            
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General               0     Under-grad    2        Non-major   1
  84-150     2        3.00-3.49    2        D    0                                                            
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    0        F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                            P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                            I    0        Other                 2
                                            ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENME 815P 0101          University of Maryland                              Page  915
Title        SPECIAL TPCS:SOLID MEC         Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    KHAN, AKHTAR                    Fall   2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0  0  0  3  0  4.00 1173/1669  4.00  4.15  4.23 4.35  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  3  0  4.00 1094/1666  4.00  4.03  4.19 4.19  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67  392/1421  4.67  4.13  4.24 4.33  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  0  3  0  4.00 1029/1617  4.00  4.00  4.15 4.24  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  492/1555  4.33  3.48  4.00 4.07  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0  0  1  1  4.50  390/1543  4.50  3.81  4.06 4.27  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1647  5.00  4.05  4.12 4.15  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67 1068/1668  4.67  4.76  4.67 4.83  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0  1  2  4.67  239/1605  4.67  3.91  4.07 4.13  4.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0  0  0  2  1  4.33 1022/1514  4.33  4.37  4.39 4.37  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.45  4.66 4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0  0  2  1  4.33  800/1503  4.33  3.98  4.24 4.22  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0  0  0  1  2  4.67  471/1506  4.67  4.02  4.26 4.24  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1311  5.00  3.64  3.85 3.89  5.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50  445/1490  4.50  3.68  4.05 4.18  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1502  5.00  3.74  4.26 4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00    1/1489  5.00  3.79  4.29 4.44  5.00


                                    Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course Section: ENMG 652  8010            University of Maryland                              Page  916
Title       MANAGEMENT AND COMMUN.         Baltimore County                                   JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:    IZENBERG, I                 Fall  2006                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires:  11                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
        Questions                    NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   5   6  4.55  545/1669  4.55  4.14  4.23  4.35  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  399/1666  4.64  3.93  4.19  4.19  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  557/1421  4.50  4.00  4.24  4.33  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4   7  4.64  358/1617  4.64  4.02  4.15  4.24  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   3   7  4.55  308/1555  4.55  4.12  4.00  4.07  4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0   0   1   4   5  4.40  516/1543  4.40  3.98  4.06  4.27  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   2   4   5  4.27  839/1647  4.27  3.81  4.12  4.15  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  713/1668  4.91  4.72  4.67  4.83  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0   1   2   5  4.50  373/1605  4.50  3.90  4.07  4.13  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  342/1514  4.82  4.30  4.39  4.37  4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.63  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   2   9  4.82  210/1503  4.82  4.15  4.24  4.22  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   1   1   9  4.73  394/1506  4.73  4.07  4.26  4.24  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0   0   1   1   9  4.73  158/1311  4.73  4.14  3.85  3.89  4.73


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   9  4.73  289/1490  4.73  4.11  4.05  4.18  4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1502  5.00  4.32  4.26  4.46  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1489  5.00  4.23  4.29  4.44  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0   0   0   0   5   6  4.55  220/1006  4.55  4.20  4.00  4.11  4.55


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0  0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 233  ****  3.81  4.19  4.41  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   52/ 112  4.67  4.53  4.38  4.39  4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67   45/  97  4.67  4.23  4.36  4.38  4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   52/  92  4.33  3.93  4.22  4.36  4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   42/ 105  4.67  4.17  4.20  4.23  4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8   0   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   38/  98  4.33  3.80  3.95  3.93  4.33


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/  58  5.00  3.70  4.22  4.53  5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8  0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   21/  52  4.67  3.53  4.06  4.57  4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       8   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67   23/  39  4.67  4.67  4.39  4.90  4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   9   0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  40  ****  2.40  3.97  4.31  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  4.55  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/  55  5.00  4.48  4.34  4.45  5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  42  ****  4.67  4.31  4.40  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  46  ****  4.00  4.45  4.61  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       8   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  4.60  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
```