Course-Section: ENME 204 0101

Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: SU, HAIJUN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 801 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	1	4	11	0	3.21	1575/1639	3.11	3.89	4.27	4.35	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	5	2	3.16	1569/1639	2.68	3.96	4.22	4.27	3.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	4	8	3	3.56	1258/1397	3.33	4.09	4.28	4.39	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	6	6	4	3.67	1324/1583	3.48	3.91	4.19	4.28	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	7	3	3	0	2.47	1504/1532	2.09	3.61	4.01	4.09	2.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	7	5	3	3.44	1240/1504	3.11	3.93	4.05	4.09	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	5	2	4	2.90	1548/1612	2.95	3.96	4.16	4.21	2.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1	17	4.74	913/1635	4.87	4.74	4.65	4.63	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	1	8	3	1	2.88	1516/1579	2.55	3.70	4.08	4.14	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	7	5	7	3.90	1318/1518	3.70	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	11	7		1377/1520	4.15	4.27	4.70	4.78	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	5	6	5	2		1453/1517	2.78	3.87	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	4	4	6		1368/1550	2.87	3.73	4.22	4.33	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	3	7	5	3.67	894/1295	3.27	3.55	3.94	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	5	2	3 64	1052/1398	3.64	3.81	4.07	4.14	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	6	0	2		1321/1391	3.00	3.90	4.30	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	4	4	3	0		1342/1388	2.91	4.01	4.28	4.37	2.91
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.42	3.93	4.00	3.00
T all assat assat														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	2	4	1	2 75	175/ 224	4.13	2 00	4.10	1 22	2 75
<u> </u>	12	0	0	0	3 2	4	7	3.75 4.00	148/ 240	3.90	3.99 4.00	4.10	4.33	3.75 4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	2	1	4 2	2	3.25	209/ 219	3.25	4.00	4.11	4.47	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	158/ 215	4.00	3.93	4.44	4.43	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	3	0	1	∠ 3	3 0	∠ 1	3.20	188/ 198	3.40	3.93	4.35	4.43	3.20
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	12	3	U	Т	3	U	Τ	3.40	100/ 198	3.40	3.77	4.10	4.00	3.40

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102

Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: SU, HAIJUN

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 802 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies		_		tructor	Course	-			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	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.11	3.89	4.27	4.35	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	3	0	0	2.20	1636/1639	2.68	3.96	4.22	4.27	2.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1353/1397	3.33	4.09	4.28	4.39	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1472/1583	3.48	3.91	4.19	4.28	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	0	1	1	0	1.71	1530/1532	2.09	3.61	4.01	4.09	1.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	5	2	0	2.78	1452/1504	3.11	3.93	4.05	4.09	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1519/1612	2.95	3.96	4.16	4.21	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.87	4.74	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	4	0	0	2.22	1567/1579	2.55	3.70	4.08	4.14	2.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1419/1518	3.70	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1397/1520	4.15	4.27	4.70	4.78	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	5	0	0		1498/1517	2.78	3.87	4.27	4.34	2.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	1	0	2.33	1505/1550	2.87	3.73	4.22	4.33	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1203/1295	3.27	3.55	3.94	4.07	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2 50	****/1398	3.64	3.81	4.07	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/1391	3.00	3.90	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/1388	2.91	4.01	4.28	4.37	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 958		3.42	3.93	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	51/ 224		3.99	4.10	4.33	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	182/ 240	3.90	4.00	4.11	4.47	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	209/ 219	3.25	4.23	4.44	4.61	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	158/ 215	4.00	3.93	4.35	4.43	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	168/ 198	3.40	3.99	4.18	4.08	3.60

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101 University of Maryland Title STRUCT/PROP: ENGR MATER

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 803

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 100 Questionnaires: 88 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

ZUPAN, MARC

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1 Did vo	nı dəin n	ew insights,ski		m this course	4	0	3	1	5	14	61	4.54	582/1639	4.54	3.89	4.27	4.28	4.54
		ctor make clear			4	0	2	3	6	16	57	4.46	583/1639	4.46	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.46
		uestions reflec		_	3	0	3	3	7	15	57	4.41	646/1397	4.41	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.41
	_	uations reflect			6	22	3	2	6	13	36	4.28	761/1583	4.28	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.28
				what you learned	4	20	1	2	18	22	21	3.94	869/1532	3.94	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.94
	_			o what you learned	4	16	1	1	6	22	38	4.40	498/1504		3.93	4.05	4.12	4.40
		g system clearl		-	4	0	2	1	7	14	60	4.54	459/1612			4.16	4.12	4.54
		was class cand			4	0	0	0	0	4	80	4.95	331/1635	4.95	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.95
	-			hing effectiveness	19	0	1	1	6	10	51	4.58	312/1579	4.58	3.70		4.07	4.58
						-	_	_	-				,					
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	8	0	2	0	0	8	70	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.80
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	7	0	2	0	0	2	77	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.88
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	8	0	1	2	4	17	56	4.56	523/1517	4.56	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.56
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	7	0	1	1	3	11	65	4.70	414/1550	4.70	3.73	4.22	4.20	4.70
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	our understanding	9	1	2	0	3	17	56	4.60	221/1295	4.60	3.55	3.94	3.95	4.60
		Discus																
				what you learned	78	0	2	0	0	2	6		****/1398	****	3.81	4.07	4.13	****
				ed to participate	78	0	1	0	1	2	6		****/1391	****	3.90	4.30	4.35	****
				d open discussion	78	0	1	0	0	2	7		****/1388	****	4.01	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		78	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	3.97	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A 26		Red	 quir	 ed f	or M	aior		0	Graduate	 -	0	Majo	 r	75
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 45		100	~1 ~ + + \		Ü- 11	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	~	•	CI dadac.	_	Ü	.10.50	-	. 3
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	20	C 5		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 8	88	Non-	major	13
84-150	28	3.00-3.49	14	D 0									5-				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Otl	her				7	15	_		5			
				? 2	Other													

Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER

Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 804 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion:	œ		NIP	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5 1		Genera		. 1 .	•	0	0	0	0	0		4 05	000/1600	4 05	2 00	4 05	4 00	4 05
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0 2	2 2	2 1	4		890/1639		3.89		4.28	4.25
		ctor make clear uestions reflec			0	3	0	2	0	0	-		1432/1639 1151/1397			4.22	4.20 4.26	3.63
	_						0	2	1	1							4.26	
		uations reflect		_	0	0 1	0	1	3	1	2		1178/1583 1201/1532		3.91 3.61		4.24	3.88
				what you learned o what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2			1141/1504		3.93		4.12	
		g system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	5			669/1612				4.12	
	-	was class canc		inea	0	0	0	0	0	2			884/1635		4.74	4.65	4.12	4.75
				hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	1			312/1579		3.70		4.00	
9. HOW WO	outa you	grade the overa	II teat	ming effectiveness	U	1	U	U	Τ.	_	5	4.57	312/13/9	4.57	3.70	4.00	4.07	4.57
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1094/1518	4.25	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.25
		ctor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.50
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	886/1517	4.25	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.25
		es contribute t			0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	897/1550	4.25	3.73	4.22	4.20	4.25
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	838/1295	3.75	3.55	3.94	3.95	3.75
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass disc		what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.81	4.07	4.13	5.00	
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1391		3.90	4.30	4.35	5.00
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		5.00				
		Labora	-		_	•	_				_							
		crease understa			6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 224		3.99	4.10	4.06	5.00
_	_	_		ground information	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240		4.00	4.11	4.08	5.00
				or lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 219				4.44	
		structor provid			6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215			4.35	4.21	
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	U	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	3.99	4.18	4.04	5.00
		Semina	r															
				announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.67	4.58	4.50	4.50
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available	for ind	lividual attention	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.52	4.59	****
		Field	Work															
1 Did fi	eld expe			hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.04	4.78	****
	_			uation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53		4.63	4.05	4.31	****
		ctor available			7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42		4.63		4.63	***
				_														
			Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	ut10	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	. – – – ;	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		_				J						3		_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoue	rh	
				P 0		_							respons					-
				т О		O+1	har					6			5-			

Other

6

0

I

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 805

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 3 3.26 1563/1639 3.35 3.89 4.27 4.28 3.26 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 4 7 8 4.21 895/1639 4.16 3.96 4.22 4.20 4.21 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 2 4 13 4.58 447/1397 4.57 4.09 4.28 4.26 4.58 6 4 4.27 771/1583 4.18 3.91 4.19 4.24 4.27 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5 1 4 6 0 3 3.00 1421/1532 3.38 3.61 4.01 4.05 3.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 01 1 6 5 4.15 713/1504 4.15 3.93 4.05 4.12 4.15 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 5 11 4.37 681/1612 4.40 3.96 4.16 4.12 4.37 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 18 4.95 397/1635 4.98 4.74 4.65 4.66 4.95 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 3 7 7 0 3.24 1427/1579 3.25 3.70 4.08 4.07 3.12 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 Ω Ω 3 3 12 4.50 807/1518 4.25 4.23 4.43 4.39 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 2 0 6 7 3 3.50 1492/1520 3.61 4.27 4.70 4.68 3.50 1 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 3 9 4 3.83 1223/1517 3.62 3.87 4.27 4.23 3.83 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 3 3 4 7 3.72 1250/1550 3.30 3.73 4.22 4.20 3.72 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 2 4 2 6 3.50 978/1295 3.33 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 2 1 1 3 0 2.71 1336/1398 2.71 3.81 4.07 4.13 2.71 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 1 2 1 3 0 2.86 1354/1391 2.77 3.90 4.30 4.35 2.86 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 2 0 2 3 0 2.86 1346/1388 2.87 4.01 4.28 4.34 2.86 4. Were special techniques successful 12 4 1 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 958 3.60 3.42 3.93 3.97 **** 1 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 4 1 3.00 207/ 224 3.17 3.99 4.10 4.06 3.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 Ω 0 1 2 5 1 3.67 195/240 3.38 4.00 4.11 4.08 3.67 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 1 0 2 3 3 4.13 173/219 3.92 4.23 4.44 4.44 4.13 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 2 4 1 3.50 196/215 3.75 3.93 4.35 4.21 3.50 10 1 1 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 5 2 4.00 129/ 198 3.78 3.99 4.18 4.04 4.00

Frequency Distribution

10 1

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT Baltimore County

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT Baltimore County Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 27

Grad.

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 806 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

					Fr	eque:	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
	General															
. Did you gai	n new insights, skills	from this course	0	0	1	4	6	5	3	3.26	1563/1639	3.35	3.89	4.27	4.28	3.2
. Did the ins	tructor make clear the	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	895/1639	4.16	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.
. Did the exam	m questions reflect th	ne expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	447/1397	4.57	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.
. Did other e	valuations reflect the	e expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	771/1583	4.18	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.
. Did assigne	d readings contribute	to what you learned	0	5	1	4	6	0	3	3.00	1421/1532	3.38	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.
Did written	assignments contribut	te to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	713/1504	4.15	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.
Was the grad	ding system clearly ex	kplained	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	681/1612	4.40	3.96	4.16	4.12	4.
How many tim	mes was class cancelle	ed	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	397/1635	4.98	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.
How would yo	ou grade the overall t	teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.25	3.70	4.08	4.07	3.
	Lecture															
Were the in	structor's lectures we	ell prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1518	4.25	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.
Did the ins	tructor seem intereste	ed in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1520	3.61	4.27	4.70	4.68	3.
Was lecture	material presented an	nd explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1517	3.62	3.87	4.27	4.23	3.
	tures contribute to wh		15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1550	3.30	3.73	4.22	4.20	3.
Did audiovi	sual techniques enhand	ce your understanding	15	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1295	3.33	3.55	3.94	3.95	3.
	Discussion	1														
Did class d	iscussions contribute	to what you learned	12	0	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	1336/1398	2.71	3.81	4.07	4.13	2.
Were all st	dents actively encou	raged to participate	12	0	1	2	1	3	0	2.86	1354/1391	2.77	3.90	4.30	4.35	2.
Did the ins	cructor encourage fair	and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	1346/1388	2.87	4.01	4.28	4.34	2.
Were specia	l techniques successfu	ıl	12	4	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 958	3.60	3.42	3.93	3.97	* *
	Laboratory	7														
Did the lab	increase understandin	ng of the material	10	0	2	2	0	4	1	3.00	207/ 224	3.17	3.99	4.10	4.06	3.
Were you pro	ovided with adequate b	packground information	10	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	195/ 240	3.38	4.00	4.11	4.08	3.
	ary materials availab		10	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	173/ 219	3.92	4.23	4.44	4.44	4.
Did the lab	instructor provide as	ssistance	10	1	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	196/ 215	3.75	3.93	4.35	4.21	3
Were require	ements for lab reports	s clearly specified	10	1	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	129/ 198	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	4
		Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	3
		·														
0 - 27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
8-55 0	1.00-1.99 0	В 5			nera											
36-83		2.00-2.99 4 C 1								0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	
34-150 11	3.00-3.49 6	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

19

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 8

1

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 807 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	-	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1536/1639	3.35	3.89	4.27	4.28	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	859/1639	4.16	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.57	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	476/1583	4.18	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1201/1532	3.38	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1504	4.15	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1612	4.40	3.96	4.16	4.12	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1284/1579	3.25	3.70	4.08	4.07	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	656/1518	4.25	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1447/1520	3.61	4.27	4.70	4.68	3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1083/1517	3.62	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1289/1550	3.30	3.73	4.22	4.20	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	917/1295	3.33	3.55	3.94	3.95	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1207/1398	2.71	3.81	4.07	4.13	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	1	0		1364/1391	2.77	3.90	4.30	4.35	2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	0	1		1270/1388	2.87	4.01	4.28	4.34	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 958	3.60	3.42	3.93	3.97	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	207/ 224	3.17	3.99	4.10	4.06	3.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	231/ 240	3.38	4.00	4.11	4.08	2.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	207/ 219	3.92	4.23	4.44	4.44	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	158/ 215	3.75	3.93	4.35	4.21	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	184/ 198	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.33
J. Here regarrements for tab reports creatry specified	1	_	J	J	2	_	U	5.55	101/ 190	5.70	3.79	1.10	1.01	3.33

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 808 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	5	3	6	1	3.06	1594/1639	3.35	3.89	4.27	4.28	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.16	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	457/1397	4.57	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1010/1583	4.18	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1136/1532	3.38	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1116/1504	4.15	3.93	4.05	4.12	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	743/1612	4.40	3.96	4.16	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	4	5	2	3.43	1354/1579	3.25	3.70	4.08	4.07	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	1237/1518	4.25	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1472/1520	3.61	4.27	4.70	4.68	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	6	3	3	3.33	1405/1517	3.62	3.87	4.27	4.23	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	5	1	3	3	2.87	1467/1550	3.30	3.73	4.22	4.20	2.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1200/1295	3.33	3.55	3.94	3.95	2.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	1	5	0	2.73	1335/1398	2.71	3.81	4.07	4.13	2.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	5	0	1	5	0	2.55	1375/1391	2.77	3.90	4.30	4.35	2.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	1	3	2	2.91	1342/1388	2.87	4.01	4.28	4.34	2.91
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	818/ 958	3.60	3.42	3.93	3.97	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 224	3.17	3.99	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 240	3.38	4.00	4.11	4.08	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 219	3.92	4.23	4.44	4.44	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 215	3.75	3.93	4.35	4.21	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 198	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				2	^						

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 10 Fall 2007

Page 809 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Frequencies				3	Instructor			Course	Dept			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	5	2	3	3.80	1326/1639	3.35	3.89	4.27	4.28	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1003/1639	4.16	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	661/1397	4.57	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1192/1583	4.18	3.91	4.19	4.24	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1136/1532	3.38	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	667/1504	4.15	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	848/1612	4.40	3.96	4.16	4.12	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.25	3.70	4.08	4.07	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	2 00	1324/1518	4.25	4.23	4.43	4.39	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	2	7	2		1504/1520	3.61	4.23	4.43	4.59	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	2	2		1405/1517	3.62	3.87	4.27	4.23	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	1	1	2		1440/1550	3.30	3.73	4.22	4.20	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	2	2		1089/1295	3.33	3.55	3.94		3.29
J. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding		4	2	U		2	2	3.23	1009/1293	3.33	3.33	3.94	3.93	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	1379/1398	2.71	3.81	4.07	4.13	2.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1356/1391	2.77	3.90	4.30	4.35	2.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1371/1388	2.87	4.01	4.28	4.34	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.60	3.42	3.93	3.97	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	Λ	3.67	186/ 224	3.17	3.99	4.10	4.06	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	195/ 240	3.38	4.00	4.11	4.08	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 219	3.92	4.23	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00		3.75	3.93	4.35	4.21	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 198	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	****
5. Note requirements for tab reports creatly specified	,	_	J	J	J	_	_	1.50	, 100	3.70	3.22	1.10	1.01	
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Page 810
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 36
Questionnaires: 27
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101

MACHINE DESIGN

FARQUHAR, TONY

Title

Instructor:

				Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3		5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mea
	General														
l. Did you gain ne	ew insights, skills from this course	0	0	8	7	4	3	5	2.63	1626/1639	2.63	3.89	4.27	4.28	2.6
2. Did the instruc	ctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	11	4	8	3	1	2.22	1635/1639	2.22	3.96	4.22	4.20	2.2
. Did the exam qu	uestions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	5	9	2	2.85	1383/1397	2.85	4.09	4.28	4.26	2.8
	uations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	8	7	3	2	2.70	1571/1583	2.70	3.91	4.19	4.24	2.7
. Did assigned re	eadings contribute to what you learned	0	13	10	1	2	1	0	1.57	1531/1532	1.57	3.61	4.01	4.05	1.5
. Did written ass	signments contribute to what you learned	0	4	7	5	6	4			1483/1504		3.93	4.05	4.12	2.4
	g system clearly explained	0	1	12	5	3	6	0	2.12	1594/1612	2.12	3.96	4.16	4.12	2.1
	was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16			1265/1635					4.3
). How would you	grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	8	7	9	0	0	2.04	1572/1579	2.04	3.70	4.08	4.07	2.0
	Lecture														
	actor's lectures well prepared	1	0	9	8	5	4	0		1510/1518				4.39	2.3
	ctor seem interested in the subject	1	0	6	2	6	4	8		1508/1520		4.27	4.70	4.68	3.3
	terial presented and explained clearly	1	0	12	6	3	5			1510/1517					
	es contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	10	4	6			1491/1550				4.20	2.
. Did audiovisual	l techniques enhance your understanding	4	22	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	3.55	3.94	3.95	**
	Discussion														
	ussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	1	1	0		****/1398		3.81	4.07	4.13	* *
	nts actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	2	0		****/1391		3.90	4.30	4.35	* *
. Did the instruc	ctor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	****	4.01	4.28	4.34	**
	Laboratory														
	crease understanding of the material	26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 224		3.99	4.10	4.06	**
	ded with adequate background information	26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 240		4.00	4.11	4.08	**
	materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	0			****/ 219		4.23	4.44	4.44	**
	structor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1			****/ 215		3.93		4.21	**
. Were requiremen	nts for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.99	4.18	4.04	**
	Field Work						_								
_	rience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52		2.75	4.04	4.78	**
	y understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 53		4.63	4.05	4.31	**
	ctor available for consultation	26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 42		4.63	4.75	4.63	**
_	could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 37		4.63	4.58	4.52	**
. Did conferences	s help you carry out field activities	26	0	1	0	0	0	U	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.63	4.56	4.30	* *
	Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trik	utio:	n									
redits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 10		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55 0			-			-						J -			
8-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 12 6-83 2 2.00-2.99 6 C 1			Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	
84-150 13													-		
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 5 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh
	Р 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0		Ot	her				2	3						
	? 1														

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101 University of Maryland FLUID MECHANICS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 CARMI, SHLOMO Job IRBR3029

Page 811

	Ouestionnaire

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 59

98

						Frequencies						Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk		m this course	0	0	3	14	18	15	9	3.22	1573/1639	3.22	3.89	4.27	4.28	3.22
		ctor make clea:			0	0	7	15	20	12	5		1607/1639		3.96	4.22	4.20	2.88
		uestions refle			1	0	5	14	15	17	7		1349/1397		4.09	4.28	4.26	3.12
	_	uations reflec		_	1	25	2	9	10	7	5		1515/1583		3.91	4.19	4.24	3.12
				what you learned	1	5	5	3	13	24	8		1241/1532		3.61	4.01	4.05	3.51
				o what you learned	1	20	4	3	12	9	10		1226/1504		3.93	4.05	4.12	3.47
	the grading system clearly explained						5	5	21	13	14	3.45	1424/1612	3.45	3.96	4.16	4.12	3.45
	many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	57	5.00	1/1635		4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00
	-	hing effectiveness	9	0	6	11	27	5	1	2.68	1539/1579		3.70	4.08	4.07	2.68		
	-	_		3														
		Lectu																
		uctor's lectur			3	0	5	4	18	18	11		1428/1518		4.23	4.43	4.39	3.46
		ctor seem inte		_	2	0	4	9	15	17	12		1498/1520		4.27	4.70	4.68	3.42
		_		xplained clearly	3	0	9	21	16	7	3		1499/1517		3.87	4.27	4.23	2.54
		es contribute		-	2	0	22	12	10	6	7	2.37	1503/1550		3.73	4.22	4.20	2.37
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	5	20	11	6	7	6	4	2.59	1239/1295	2.59	3.55	3.94	3.95	2.59
		Discu																
1 Did al	laga diga			what you learned	54	0	2	1	1	1	Λ	2 20	****/1398	****	3.81	4.07	4.13	****
				d to participate	54	0	2	1	1	1	0		****/1391		3.90	4.30	4.13	****
				d open discussion	54	0	0	2	0	3	0		****/1388		4.01	4.28	4.34	****
		echniques succ		d open discussion	54	3	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 958					
1	opeoidi o	comit ques succ	000141		J -		_	ŭ	_	Ü	Ū	2.00	, , , , , ,		3.12	3.75	3.37	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trik	outic	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 12		Re	quir	red f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	54
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 26										_				
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	9	C 13		Ge	enera	ŧΤ				0	Under-g	rad 5	59	Non-	-major	5
84-150												0			1			1.
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 19 F 0					ΕŢ	.ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	m	
	P 0										respon			responses to be significant				

Other

53

I

?

0

3

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101 Page 812 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: SALLOUM, MAHER Enrollment:

Enrollment:	18				
Questionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1016/1639	4.14	3.89	4.27	4.28	4.14
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	650/1639	4.43	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.43
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.50
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	625/1583	4.38	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.38
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	430/1532	4.42	3.61	4.01	4.05	4.42
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.93	4.05	4.12	3.75
		g system clearl			1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	459/1612	4.54	3.96	4.16	4.12	4.54
8. How max	ow many times was class cancelled					2	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.74	4.65	4.66	4.75
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	601/1579	4.30	3.70	4.08	4.07	4.30
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.57
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	961/1520	4.71	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.71
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	854/1517	4.29	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.29
		es contribute t			0 1	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	638/1550	4.50	3.73	4.22	4.20	4.50
				our understanding	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	590/1295		3.55	3.94	3.95	
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	599/1398	4.29	3.81	4.07	4.13	4.29
				ed to participate	7	0	0	1	0	2	4		793/1391	4.29	3.90	4.30	4.35	4.29
		-	_	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	4		721/1388	4.43	4.01	4.28	4.34	4.43
		echniques succe		d open diboubbion	7	4	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	3.97	****
				Frequ	iencs	, Dis	trib	ut i oi	n									
				_	aciic j	DID	CIID	uc10.										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	!	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5 5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0					Ot]	her				1	.4							

13

SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Title KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 13

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Fall 2007

Baltimore County

Page 813 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	;		Inst	cructor	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	4	3	6	4.15	1003/1639	4.28	3.89	4.27	4.28	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	813/1639	4.39	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	813/1397	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1010/1583	3.95	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1104/1532	3.64	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504	4.40	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.33
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	0	5	4	4		1148/1612	4.00	3.96	4.16	4.12	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1635		4.74			5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	889/1579	4.33	3.70	4.08	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1021/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.81	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1042/1517	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	982/1550	4.37	3.73	4.22	4.20	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	3	1	0	2		1206/1295		3.55	3.94	3.95	2.86
Discussion	0	0	•	-	0	•	0	2 60	1054/1000	2 65	2 01	4 05	4 10	2 60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	2		1074/1398	3.65	3.81	4.07	4.13	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	752/1391		3.90	4.30	4.35	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1		4.33	783/1388	4.31	4.01	4.28		4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	U	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	71/ 224	4.31	3.99	4.10	4.06	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	125/ 240	4.29	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	136/ 219	4.64	4.23	4.44	4.44	4.42
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	178/ 215	3.78	3.93	4.35	4.21	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	3	4	1	4	3.50	170/ 198	3.67	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	4.40	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 80	****	4.70	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 82	****	4.70	4.16	4.08	****
or word orroctia for grading made orear		ŭ	Ü	ŭ	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 02		11.70	1110	1.00	
Field Work				_	_						_			
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	2.75	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.63	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.63	4.75	4.63	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12 12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37	****	4.63	4.58	4.52	****
. Did conferences help you carry out field activities		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.63	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.63	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														

SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Title Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 813 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

13 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County

SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Title Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. B)

13

Fall 2007

Page 814 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1003/1639	4.28	3.89	4.27	4.28	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	813/1639	4.39	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	813/1397	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1010/1583	3.95	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1104/1532	3.64	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504	4.40	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1148/1612	4.00	3.96	4.16	4.12	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.33	3.70	4.08	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1237/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	522/1550	4.37	3.73	4.22	4.20	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1295		3.55	3.94	3.95	2.86
100000000000000000000000000000000000000									,					
Discussion									4054/4000			4 0.0		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	2		1074/1398	3.65	3.81	4.07	4.13	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	752/1391		3.90	4.30	4.35	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1		4.33	783/1388	4.31	4.01	4.28		4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	3.97	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	71/ 224	4.31	3.99	4.10	4.06	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	125/ 240	4.29	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	136/ 219	4.64	4.23	4.44	4.44	4.42
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	178/ 215	3.78	3.93	4.35	4.21	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	3	4	1	4	3.50	170/ 198	3.67	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	4.40	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 80	****	4.70	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 82	****	4.70	4.16	4.08	****
or word orrotta ror grading made orear		Ü	Ü	ŭ	_	Ū	Ü	3.00	, 02		11.70	1110	1.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	2.75	4.04	4.78	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.63	4.05	4.31	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.63	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37	****	4.63	4.58	4.52	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.63	4.56	4.30	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.63	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 43	****		4.69	5.00	****
The state of the s		٠	-	-	_	-	J		, 13					

SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Title Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 814 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB Baltimore County KHAN, AKHTAR Fall 2007

Title SOLID MECH AN Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 815 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	890/1639	4.28	3.89	4.27	4.28	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1639	4.39	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	476/1583	3.95	3.91	4.19	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1136/1532	3.64	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	367/1504	4.40	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	490/1612	4.00	3.96	4.16	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	4.33	3.70	4.08	4.07	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.81	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	597/1517	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	500/1550	4.37	3.73	4.22	4.20	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.43	3.55	3.94	3.95	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	3.65	3.81	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1391	4.31	3.90	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	4.31	4.01	4.28	4.34	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	99/ 224	4.31	3.99	4.10	4.06	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	125/ 240	4.29	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 219	4.64	4.23	4.44	4.44	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	207/ 215	3.78	3.93	4.35	4.21	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	98/ 198	3.67	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.25
From	onat	. Dia	+ v i h	u+ i o	n									

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103 Unititle SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 816 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	561/1639	4.28	3.89	4.27	4.28	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	617/1639	4.39	3.96	4.22	4.20	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	973/1397	4.30	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1477/1583	3.95	3.91	4.19	4.24	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1241/1532	3.64	3.61	4.01	4.05	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	441/1504	4.40	3.93	4.05	4.12	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1327/1612	4.00	3.96	4.16	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	527/1579	4.33	3.70	4.08	4.07	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	745/1518	4.41	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1239/1520	4.81	4.27	4.70	4.68	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1083/1517	4.24	3.87	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1019/1550	4.37	3.73	4.22	4.20	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1295	2.43	3.55	3.94	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	965/1398	3.65	3.81	4.07	4.13	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1391		3.90	4.30	4.35	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	834/1388	4.31	4.01	4.28	4.34	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	111/ 224	4.31	3.99	4.10	4.06	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	98/ 240	4.29	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	79/ 219	4.64	4.23	4.44	4.44	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	132/ 215	3.78	3.93	4.35	4.21	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	176/ 198	3.67	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.43
Frequ	encv	Diet	trib	1+ i 01	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101 University of Maryland Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS Baltimore County

Page 817 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL

Enrollment:	90				
Ouestionnaires:	66	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	ills fro	m this course	1	0	1	3	12	19	30	4.14	1029/1639	4.14	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.14
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	2	8	20	35	4.35	748/1639	4.35	3.96	4.22	4.29	4.35
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	ct the e	xpected goals	2	0	1	0	8	14	41	4.47	574/1397	4.47	4.09	4.28	4.38	4.47
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	6	2	3	8	19	27	4.12	929/1583	4.12	3.91	4.19	4.31	4.12
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	2	11	3	1	10	6	33	4.23	607/1532	4.23	3.61	4.01	4.07	4.23
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments conti	ribute t	o what you learned	1 3	6	3	2	14	12	26	3.98	848/1504	3.98	3.93	4.05	4.20	3.98
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	ly expla	ined	2	0	1	1	6	21	35	4.38	669/1612	4.38	3.96	4.16	4.18	4.38
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		3	2	0	0	1	17	43	4.69	979/1635	4.69	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.69
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	hing effectiveness	12	3	1	4	18	19	9	3.61	1270/1579	3.61	3.70	4.08	4.21	3.61
		Lectur																
1 Were t	the instr	uctor's lectur		nrenared	2	0	0	1	7	19	37	4 44	905/1518	4 44	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.44
		ctor seem inter			2	0	1	3	7	22	31		1363/1520		4.27	4.70	4.75	4.23
					2	-	0	5	13	22	24		1077/1517	4.02	3.87	4.27	4.34	4.02
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	2	3	9	4	19	27		1135/1550		3.73	4.22	4.24	
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi:				4		7	7	13				1076/1295		3.55			3.31
J. Dia ac	aaiovibaa.	r ccciniiques ei	mance y	our unacrocanaring	-		,	,	13		13	3.31	10/0/12/5	3.31	3.33	3.51	1.01	3.31
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	56	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	****/1398	***	3.81	4.07	4.23	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively er	ncourage	d to participate	58	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/1391	***	3.90	4.30	4.48	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	58	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	****/1388	****	4.01	4.28	4.50	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		58	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	4.24	****
				Frod	quency	, Dia	+vib	ı+i.c	'n									
				ried	quency	/ DIS	CLID	истс)11									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades	3			Re	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 34		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 laior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	64
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 23			-1 ~ -1			(-	-	or adda c	-	-		-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	11	C 3		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 6	6	Non-	-major	2
84-150	42	3.00-3.49	21	D 0								-	5		-		3	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_j h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot	her				6	2	-					
				? 2														

Course-Section: ENME 425 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERNAL COMBUS ENGINE

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 13

Page 818 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	סמוכמו

	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	990/1639	4.17	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	948/1639	4.17	3.96	4.22	4.29	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.09	4.28	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	953/1583	4.08	3.91	4.19	4.31	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	1	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.61	4.01	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.93	4.05	4.20	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1327/1612	3.67	3.96	4.16	4.18	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	312/1579	4.57	3.70	4.08	4.21	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	643/1518	4.64	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.27	4.70	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1182/1517	3.91	3.87	4.27	4.34	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	953/1550	4.18	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	2	4	1	1	2.70	1225/1295	2.70	3.55	3.94	4.01	2.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	625/1398	4.25	3.81	4.07	4.23	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1391	4.25	3.90	4.30	4.48	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.63	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
The area		- 5 .4 - 4			_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	1	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 sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101 University of Maryland Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB Baltimore County

Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB Baltimore Count Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL Fall 2007

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 819 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies Ins			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1296/1639	3.86	3.89	4.27	4.42	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	0	3.31	1542/1639	3.59	3.96	4.22	4.29	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	3.75	4.09	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1303/1583	3.83	3.91	4.19	4.31	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1532	4.42	3.61	4.01	4.07	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	786/1504	4.30	3.93	4.05	4.20	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	4	3	2	3.23	1479/1612	3.62	3.96	4.16	4.18	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.74	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1232/1579	3.64	3.70	4.08	4.21	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1110/1518	4.32	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1451/1520	3.86	4.27	4.70	4.75	3.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1042/1517	3.93	3.87	4.27	4.34	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	5	1	3	3.33	1385/1550	3.07	3.73	4.22	4.24	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	938/1295	3.59	3.55	3.94	4.01	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1357/1398	2.50	3.81	4.07	4.23	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1281/1391	3.25	3.90	4.30	4.48	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	129/ 224	3.96	3.99	4.10	4.49	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	5	5	1	3.38	213/ 240	3.23	4.00	4.11	4.26	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	2	2	4	4	1	3.00	213/ 219	3.57	4.23	4.44	4.42	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	3	3	3	3	0	2.50	211/ 215	2.75	3.93	4.35	4.28	2.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	1	7	2	1	2.92	195/ 198	3.37	3.99	4.18	4.21	2.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.40	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0			****	4.70	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 82	****	4.70	4.16	4.02	****
or note official for grading made official		Ü	ŭ	_	ŭ	Ū	Ü	2.00	, 02		110	1.10	1.02	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	4.63	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.63	4.75	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.63	4.58	4.73	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	***	4.63	4.56	4.64	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.63	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
		٠	-	,	_	-	•		, 32					

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB

Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 819 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102 University of Maryland FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Page 820 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Firalijation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

							Fre	anner	ncies			Tngt	tructor	Cours	e Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
1 511		General		. 1 .	0	0	0	•		_		4 00	1120/162		2 00	4 00	4 40	4 00
		w insights, skil			0	0	0	0	4	3	4		1138/1639			4.27	4.42	4.00
		tor make clear	_	_	0	0	0	0	5	2	4		1262/1639		3.96	4.22		3.91
	_	estions reflect		_	0	9	0	0	2	0	0		****/1397			4.28	4.38	****
		ations reflect	_	_	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10				4.19	4.31	4.10
		adings contribu			1	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33				4.01		4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2			268/1504			4.05	4.20	4.64
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	1	4	2			1245/1612		3.96	4.16		3.82
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	1			662/1635			4.65	4.72	4.90
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overal	.1 teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	5	Τ	3.60	1270/1579	3.64	3.70	4.08	4.21	3.60
		Lecture	خ															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures		repared	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	989/1518	3 4.32	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.36
		tor seem intere	_	-	0	0	0	0	4	3	4		1414/1520			4.70	4.75	4.00
		erial presented		_	0	0	0	0	4	3			1083/1517			4.27	4.34	4.00
		s contribute to			0	1	3	1	2	3			1473/1550			4.22		2.80
				ur understanding	0	2	0	1	3	2		3.78				3.94		
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	. ccciniiques cini	lance yo	ar anacrocanaring	O	2	O	_	5	2	5	3.70	023/12/3	, 3.35	3.33	3.51	1.01	3.70
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1398	2.50	3.81	4.07	4.23	****
2. Were a	ll studen	its actively enc	couraged	to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1391	3.25	3.90	4.30	4.48	****
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage f	fair and	open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1388	3.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	***
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	4.24	***
		T - 1 t-																
1 Did th	e lah ind	Laborat rease understan:	-	the material	0	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	118/ 224	3.96	3.99	4.10	4.49	4.09
			_	round information	1	0	1	1	3	3		3.40	212/ 240			4.11		3.40
				r lab activities	1	0	0	1	4	2		3.70	206/ 219			4.44		3.70
	_	structor provide			1	1	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	210/ 215			4.35		2.56
		its for lab repo			1	0	1	2	2	1	-	3.50	170/ 198			4.18		3.50
J. Wele I	edarremen	ics for lab repo	ills cie	arry specified		U		4	4	_	4	3.50	170/ 198) 3.31	3.99	4.10	4.21	3.30
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.83	***
		Field W				_		_	_	_								
	_	rience contribut		_	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52		2.75	4.04		****
2. Did you	u clearly	understand you	ır evalu	ation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.63	4.05	4.58	***
		Self P	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu		hat you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50) ****	4.63	4.45	4.85	***
	1			1														
	Fr						cribu	ution	ı									
Credita F	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Por	asons				ጥ	me			Majors	•
crearcs E		Cuiii. GPA												/pe 				·
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-	grad	11	Non-	-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 1					Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means	there a	are no	t enoug	jh	
P 0				Electives						respons	ses to :	be sigr	nifica	nt				
	I 0				Other 11													
5 U																		

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103 University of Maryland FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB Baltimore County

Title Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL Fall 2007

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 821

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 2 1 6 2 3.73 1378/1639 3.86 3.89 4.27 4.42 3.73 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 1 2 5 2 3.55 1466/1639 3.59 3.96 4.22 4.29 3.55 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 7 0 1 0 2 1 3.75 1175/1397 3.75 4.09 4.28 4.38 3.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 1 1 1 4 3 3.70 1296/1583 3.83 3.91 4.19 4.31 3.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 5 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 335/1532 4.42 3.61 4.01 4.07 4.50 0 1 6 3 4.20 667/1504 4.30 3.93 4.05 4.20 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 1 3 3 3 3.80 1253/1612 3.62 3.96 4.16 4.18 3.80 1 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1635 4.97 4.74 4.65 4.72 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 3 3 2 3.67 1232/1579 3.64 3.70 4.08 4.21 3.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 5 5 4.36 989/1518 4.32 4.23 4.43 4.51 4.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 2 1 6 2 3.73 1470/1520 3.86 4.27 4.70 4.75 3.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 5 4 2 3.73 1272/1517 3.93 3.87 4.27 4.34 3.73 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 4 1 3 2 3.09 1433/1550 3.07 3.73 4.22 4.24 3.09 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 1 3 3 2 3.40 1035/1295 3.59 3.55 3.94 4.01 3.40 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1398 2.50 3.81 4.07 4.23 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1391 3.25 3.90 4.30 4.48 **** 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1388 3.00 4.01 4.28 4.50 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 04. Were special techniques successful 11 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.42 3.93 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 0 0 2 3.80 167/224 3.96 3.99 4.10 4.49 3.80 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 1 3 2 4 0 2.90 226/240 3.23 4.00 4.11 4.26 2.90 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 1 1 5 3 4.00 179/ 219 3.57 4.23 4.44 4.42 4.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 2 0 3 4 1 3.20 205/ 215 2.75 3.93 4.35 4.28 3.20 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 0 5 3 2 3.70 162/198 3.37 3.99 4.18 4.21 3.70 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 5.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.63 4.45 4.85 **** 0 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 5.00 4.51 4.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 5.00 4.69 4.85 **** 11 0 0 Ω 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 5.00 4.37 4.67 ****

Frequency Distribution

11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.52 4.50 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101 University of Maryland Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI Baltimore County

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH Fall 2007

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

Enrollment: 11

Ouestionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 822

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 0 2 2 3.25 1565/1639 3.13 3.89 4.27 4.42 3.25 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 1553/1639 3.13 3.96 4.22 4.29 3.25 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 1 2 3 3.75 1175/1397 3.38 4.09 4.28 4.38 3.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 2 4 2 4.00 1010/1583 3.40 3.91 4.19 4.31 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 774/1532 3.38 3.61 4.01 4.07 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 3 1 3.29 1330/1504 3.02 3.93 4.05 4.20 3.29 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 364/1612 3.61 3.96 4.16 4.18 4.63 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1589/1635 3.96 4.74 4.65 4.72 3.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 2 0 2 1 3.40 1364/1579 3.37 3.70 4.08 4.21 3.40 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 529/1518 4.26 4.23 4.43 4.51 4.71 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 2 0 0 2 3 3.57 1487/1520 3.39 4.27 4.70 4.75 3.57 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 0 0 4 2 3.86 1211/1517 3.63 3.87 4.27 4.34 3.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 0 1 3 1 3.50 1328/1550 3.45 3.73 4.22 4.24 3.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 5 1 4.17 529/1295 3.78 3.55 3.94 4.01 4.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 426/1398 4.00 3.81 4.07 4.23 4.50

Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1388 4.50 4.01 4.28 4.50 ****

6 0

0

0

0 1 1 4.50 616/1391 3.50 3.90 4.30 4.48 4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 444 0102 University of Maryland Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 6

Page 823 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.13	3.89	4.27	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	0	1		1579/1639		3.96	4.22	4.29	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1363/1397	3.38	4.09	4.28	4.38	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1567/1583	3.40	3.91	4.19	4.31	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1477/1532	3.38	3.61	4.01	4.07	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1457/1504	3.02	3.93	4.05	4.20	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1572/1612	3.61	3.96	4.16	4.18	2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1415/1635	3.96	4.74	4.65	4.72	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.37	3.70	4.08	4.21	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3 80	1351/1518	4 26	4.23	4.43	4.51	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	1	1		1509/1520		4.27	4.70	4.75	3.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	0		1384/1517	3.63	3.87	4.27	4.34	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	0	2		1368/1550		3.73	4.22	4.24	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	0	1	2		1035/1295		3.55	3.94	4.01	3.40
5. Dia addiovipadi econniques cimanee your anderstanding	_	Ü	_	_	Ü	_	-	3.10	1033/1233	3.70	3.33	3.71	1.01	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1106/1398	4.00	3.81	4.07	4.23	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1377/1391	3.50	3.90	4.30	4.48	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	4.24	****
P		- -	1											

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

Course-Section: ENME 475 0101 University of Maryland Title ROBOTICS Instructor: TASCH, URI

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 824

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 30 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Insi	tructor	Course	e Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mear
1 1	General		•	0	•	0	-	_	0.0	4 50	240/1620	4 50	2 00	4 00	4 40	4 8
	new insights, skills from		0	0	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	342/1639	4.73	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.7
	ructor make clear the expec	_	0	0	0	1	1 2	4	24 26	4.70	316/1639		3.96	4.22	4.29	4.7
	questions reflect the expe	-		6	1	2				4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.09	4.28	4.38	4.8
	aluations reflect the expedings contribute to who		0	13	2	0	1	4 5	16 7	4.33	697/1583 926/1532		3.91 3.61	4.19 4.01	4.31	4.3
	assignments contribute to what	-	1	9	1	1	2	5 7	9	4.10	770/1504		3.93	4.01	4.07	4.1
	ing system clearly explaine		0	0	0	1	2	4	23	4.63	352/1612		3.96	4.16	4.18	4.6
	ling system crearry explaint mes was class cancelled	z u	1	0	0	0	1	26	23		1484/1635		4.74	4.65	4.72	4.0
-	ou grade the overall teaching	na effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	- ,			4.08	4.21	
. How would yo	d grade the overall teaching	ig effectiveness	J	U	U	U		0	10	4.00	203/13/9	4.00	3.70	1.00	7.21	1.0
	Lecture															
	tructor's lectures well pro		0	0	0	0	4	5	21	4.57	733/1518	4.57	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.5
	ructor seem interested in	-	0	0	0	0	2	2	26	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.27	4.70	4.75	4.8
	material presented and exp	_	1	0	1	1	2	5	20	4.45	674/1517		3.87	4.27	4.34	4.4
	ures contribute to what you		0	0	1	1	1	4	23	4.57	568/1550	4.57	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.5
. Did audiovis	ual techniques enhance you	r understanding	1	4	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	256/1295	4.52	3.55	3.94	4.01	4.5
	Discussion															
. Did class di	scussions contribute to what	at vou learned	21	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	651/1398	4.22	3.81	4.07	4.23	4.2
	dents actively encouraged		21	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	368/1391	4.78	3.90	4.30	4.48	4.7
. Did the inst	ructor encourage fair and	open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.5
. Were special	techniques successful		21	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	4.24	***
	Laboratory															
. Did the lab	increase understanding of	the material	27	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.49	***
	vided with adequate backgro		28	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.00	4.11	4.26	***
	ry materials available for		28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	***
	instructor provide assista		28	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	3.93	4.35	4.28	***
	ments for lab reports clea:		28	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 198	****	3.99	4.18	4.21	* * *
		Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
	Corr. CD3	_									m				24	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке:	ason	.s 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	A 23		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	or	28
28-55 0																
56-83 0					nera	1			1	.8	Under-g	rad 2	27	Non-	-major	2
4-150 17 3.00-3.49 10 D 0																
Frad. 3 3.50-4.00 8 F 0				El	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	there a	are not	enoug	jh
P 0											respons	es to k	oe sign	nificar	nt	
I 0				Ot1	her				1	.1						
? 0																

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101 University of Maryland Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB Baltimore County

CONTROLS/VIB LAB Baltimore County or: ANJANAPPA, MUNI Fall 2007

Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

Page 825 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	סמוכמו

			Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	6		841/1639	3.97	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	2	5		1350/1639	3.92	3.96	4.22	4.29	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	942/1397	4.19	4.09	4.28	4.38	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	5		1010/1583			4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	0	2	4		1046/1532		3.61	4.01	4.07	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504			4.05	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	924/1612	3.78	3.96	4.16	4.18	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1			,		4.74	4.65		4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1109/1579	3.94	3.70	4.08	4.21	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1094/1518	4.32	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	992/1520	4.45	4.27	4.70	4.75	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	4		1036/1517	4.14	3.87	4.27	4.34	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	4		1188/1550	3.53	3.73	4.22	4.24	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	894/1295	3.08	3.55	3.94		3.67
Diamondon														
Discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	020/1200	2 00	2 01	4 07	1 22	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1 1	1	2 1		929/1398	3.80 3.50	3.81	4.07 4.30	4.23	3.80 3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	2		1220/1391		3.90			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	2	0		0	_		4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	U	0	U	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	* * * *	3.42	3.93	4.24	* * * *
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	175/ 224	3.92	3.99	4.10	4.49	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	199/ 240	3.61	4.00	4.11	4.26	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	125/ 219	4.03	4.23	4.44	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	6	0	3.50	196/ 215	3.70	3.93	4.35	4.28	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	98/ 198	3.95	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.40	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.70	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.16	4.02	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.04	4.84	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.63	4.05	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 42	****				****
	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 37	****	4.63	4.75	4.71 4.73	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	1	1	0			, , ,	****	4.63	4.58		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	U	U	Т	Τ	U	0	2.50	****/ 32		4.63	4.56	4.64	
Self Paced					_									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.63	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 825 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102 University of Maryland Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB Baltimore County

Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2007

Page 826 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	Λ	0	2	2	1	2 00	1326/1639	3.97	3.89	4.27	4.42	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1		1090/1639	3.92	3.96	4.22	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam guestions reflect the expected goals	n	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	795/1397	4.19	4.09	4.28	4.38	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	1		1261/1583	3.83	3.91	4.19	4.31	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	n	3	0	0	٥	2	0	4.00	774/1532		3.61	4.01	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	0		1259/1504	3.71	3.93	4.05	4.20	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	1		1360/1612	3.78	3.96	4.16	4.18	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635		4.74	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	889/1579	3.94	3.70	4.08	4.21	
	-	_		-	•	-	-							
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	947/1518	4.32	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1377/1520	4.45	4.27	4.70	4.75	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	947/1517	4.14	3.87	4.27	4.34	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1411/1550	3.53	3.73	4.22	4.24	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1247/1295	3.08	3.55	3.94	4.01	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/1398		3.81	4.07	4.23	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1391	3.50	3.90	4.30	4.48	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	4.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	****
T alassa kassa														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	129/ 224	3.92	3.99	4.10	4 40	4.00
9	0	0	0	1	1	2		3.60	201/ 240	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.49 4.26	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	0	2	1 2	3.80	201/ 240	4.03	4.00	4.11	4.42	3.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	1	1	2		192/ 215	3.70	3.93	4.44	4.42	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	U	Τ	J T	2	3.80	192/ 215	3.70	3.93	4.35	4.28	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	U	U	Τ	U	U	4	۷	3.80	15// 198	3.95	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.80

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

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102 University of Maryland Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 827

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 3.80 1326/1639 3.97 3.89 4.27 4.42 3.80 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.00 1090/1639 3.92 3.96 4.22 4.29 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 $^{\circ}$ 1 0 0 3 4.25 795/1397 4.19 4.09 4.28 4.38 4.25 0 2 1 1 3.75 1261/1583 3.83 3.91 4.19 4.31 3.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 774/1532 3.92 3.61 4.01 4.07 4.00 1 1 3 0 3.40 1259/1504 3.71 3.93 4.05 4.20 3.40 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 2 1 3.60 1360/1612 3.78 3.96 4.16 4.18 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1635 4.97 4.74 4.65 4.72 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 889/1579 3.94 3.70 4.08 4.21 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 Ω Ω Ω 1 5.00 ****/1518 4.32 4.23 4.43 4.51 4.40 Ω 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 5.00 ****/1520 4.45 4.27 4.70 4.75 4.20 4 0 0 0 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.34 4.20 0 4.00 ****/1550 3.53 3.73 4.22 4.24 3.20 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 1 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1295 3.08 3.55 3.94 4.01 2.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1398 3.80 3.81 4.07 4.23 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1391 3.50 3.90 4.30 4.48 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1388 4.00 4.01 4.28 4.50 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 0 2 4.00 129/ 224 3.92 3.99 4.10 4.49 4.00 0 0 2 1 1 3.60 201/240 3.61 4.00 4.11 4.26 3.60 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 1 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 200/219 4.03 4.23 4.44 4.42 3.80 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 0 0 1 1 1 2 3.80 192/ 215 3.70 3.93 4.35 4.28 3.80 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 0 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 157/198 3.95 3.99 4.18 4.21 3.80

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	2	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	Electives		responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				_	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489C 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MACROMECHANICS/COMPOSI

Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17

9

0

84-150

Grad.

7

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 4

D 0

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 828 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

			T7-00	equer		~		Tna	tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDO	T orrol	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	equer 2	3	s 4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	3			1416/1639			4.27	4.42	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	8	1		1432/1639		3.96	4.22	4.29	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	6			1256/1397		4.09	4.28	4.38	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	2	2	5			1345/1583		3.91	4.19	4.31	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	3	1			1360/1532		3.61	4.01	4.07	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	5	0			1183/1504		3.93	4.05	4.20	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	2	4				1451/1612			4.16	4.18	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13			1434/1635			4.65	4.72	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	7	1	4	3.50	1318/1579	3.50	3.70	4.08	4.21	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1301/1518	3.92	4.23	4.43	4.51	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	2	7		1363/1520		4.27	4.70	4.75	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1		4	2		1335/1517		3.87	4.27	4.34	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	5			1043/1550			4.22	4.24	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	0	1	0	1		****/1295			3.94		****
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	****	4.01	4.28	4.50	****
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****
		-	-		-	•	_		,					
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Maiors	
Expected Grades						- 								
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 13		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	13
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 2														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1		Ger	neral	ı				9	Under-q	rad 1	7	Mon	major	4

Electives

Other

Course-Section: ENME 489E 0101 University of Maryland Title ELECTROMAG ENERGY CNVR

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Page 829 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General														
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.50	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.50
		ctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	517/1639		3.96	4.22		4.50
		uestions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.00	973/1397		4.09	4.28		4.00
	_	uations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	476/1583		3.91	4.19	4.31	
		eadings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532		3.61	4.01	4.07	5.0
	-	signments contribute to what you learne	d 0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		5.00	3.93	4.05	4.20	5.0
		g system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00				4.16	4.18	
		was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.65	4.72	5.00
		grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		5.00				
		Lecture														
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.23	4.43	4.51	5.00
		ctor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1520				4.75	
		terial presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0				5.00	1/1517				4.34	
		es contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1550				4.24	
		l techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		5.00				
		Discussion														
1 Did cl	agg dige	ussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3 81	4.07	4.23	5.00
		nts actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1391			4.30	4.48	5.00
		ctor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1388			4.28		
		echniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 958				4.24	
		Seminar														
1 Were a	agianed t	topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.67	4.58	4.83	5.00
	-	ctor available for individual attention			0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 82			4.52		5.00
		rojects contribute to what you learned	1		0	0				5.00	1/ 78				4.56	
	_	ons contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 80				4.59	
5. Were c	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	,	5.00						
	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credits E	:S			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
												- 				
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1

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

Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101

Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE

Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC

Enrollment:

30 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 830 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain now insights skills from this govern	0	0	0	1	2	1 2	_	4 00	1138/1639	4.00	2 00	4 27	1 12	4 00
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	1 1	3 2	13 14	5 5		1059/1639		3.89 3.96	4.27	4.42	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55			4.09	4.28	4.38	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	8	7		1010/1583		3.91	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	5	6	4		1300/1532		3.61	4.01	4.07	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	9	3	2		1444/1504		3.93	4.05	4.20	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	6	8		1044/1612		3.96	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7			1087/1635		4.74	4.65	4.72	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	9	5	1		1336/1579				4.21	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	12	5	4.05	1223/1518	4.05	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	961/1520	4.71	4.27	4.70	4.75	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	1132/1517	3.95	3.87	4.27	4.34	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	1057/1550	4.05	3.73	4.22	4.24	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.55	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	625/1398	4.25	3.81	4.07	4.23	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	887/1391	4.17	3.90	4.30	4.48	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.01	4.28	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.42	3.93	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 224		3.99	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240		4.00	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****
Seminar												. =0		
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85		4.67	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 82		4.70	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78		4.40	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 80		4.70	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.16	4.02	***
Field Work	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 52	****	2.75	4 0 4	4 04	****
 Did field experience contribute to what you learned Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52 ****/ 53		2.75 4.63	4.04	4.84 4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42		4.63		4.58	****
						0						4.75		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37 ****/ 32		4.63 4.63	4.58 4.56	4.73 4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	"""/ 32		4.03	4.50	4.04	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 50		4.63	4.45	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43		5.00	4.69	4.85	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.50	****

Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101

Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE

Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 830 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	0	General	16	Under-grad	22	Non-major	4	
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	5					
				?	1							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION

Instructor: MA, RONGHUI (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 7

Enrollment: 10

Page 831 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	I	Fall	2007	
Student	Course	Eval	uation	Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies	:		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.71	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	3.96	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.09	4.28	4.37	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	697/1583	4.33		4.19	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	553/1532	4.29	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.93	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2			259/1612		3.96	4.16	4.27	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3			1087/1635	4.57		4.65	4.81	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	3.70	4.08	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.27	4.70	4.79	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	3.87	4.27	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	3.62	3.73	4.22	4.23	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3		4.50	265/1295		3.55		3.95	4.50
J. Did dudiovisual ecciniques cimanee your understanding	_	U	O	O	Ü	3	5	1.50	203/12/3	1.50	3.33	3.51	3.75	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	3.81	4.07	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	3.90	4.30	4.47	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.01	4.28	4.49	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.42	3.93	4.01	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240		4.00	4.10	3.96	5.00
	5	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 240	5.00 5.00	4.00	4.11	4.23	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	0								
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215 1/ 198	5.00 5.00	3.93	4.35	4.72 4.74	5.00 5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	3.99	4.18	4./4	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.67	4.58	4.58	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.70	4.52	4.74	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	53/ 78	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	44/ 80	4.50	4.70	4.47	4.50	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 82	4.50	4.70	4.16	4.37	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	45/ 52	2.00	2.75	4.04	3.64	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	18/ 53	4.50			4.03	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5 5	0	0	0	0	1	1				4.63	4.05		
	-	0	0		0	1		4.50	- ,	4.50	4.63	4.75	4.78	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	-	-	0	-	_		4.50	22/ 37			4.58	4.33	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 32	4.50	4.63	4.56	4.59	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 50	4.50	4.63	4.45	4.39	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	****

Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION

Instructor: MA, RONGHUI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 831 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland

Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION

Instructor: Enrollment: (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 832 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

FIII OTTIMETIC.	T 0
Ouestionnaires:	7

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	NR 	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Moan	Mean	Mean	Moan	
									icaine	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.71	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	3.96	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.09	4.28	4.37	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	697/1583	4.33	3.91	4.19	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	553/1532	4.29	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.93	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1612		3.96	4.16	4.27	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1087/1635	4.57	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.57
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1440/1550	3.62	3.73	4.22	4.23	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 75	260/1398	4.75	2 01	4.07	4.22	1 75
	3 3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75			3.81			4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate								4.75	393/1391	4.75	3.90	4.30	4.47	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0 1	0 1	0	0	2	3	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.01	4.28	4.49	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	Τ	Τ	0	0	2	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.42	3.93	4.01	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.43	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.00	4.11	3.96	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	3.93	4.35	4.72	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	3.99	4.18	4.74	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.67	4.58	4.58	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.70	4.52	4.74	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	53/ 78	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	44/ 80	4.50	4.70	4.47	4.50	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 82	4.50	4.70	4.16	4.37	4.50
J. Were Criteria for grading made crear	J	U	U	U	U	1	_	1.50	33/ 02	4.50	1.70	4.10	4.57	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	45/ 52	2.00	2.75	4.04	3.64	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 53	4.50	4.63	4.05	4.03	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 42	4.50	4.63	4.75	4.78	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 37	4.50	4.63	4.58	4.33	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 32	4.50	4.63	4.56	4.59	4.50
5. Did conferences help you early out little detryletes	5	O	Ü	O	O	_	_	1.50	17/ 52	1.50	1.05	1.50	1.35	1.50
Self Paced	_	0	_	0	0	1	-1	4 50	20/ 52	4 50	4 63	4 45	4 20	4 50
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 50	4.50	4.63	4.45	4.39	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	****

ADV. COND. & RADIATION

Title (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 7 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 832 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION

Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 7

84-150

Grad.

0

4

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

3

0

0

D F

Ρ

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 833 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				Fr	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.71	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.7
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639		3.96	4.22	4.26	5.0
	_		the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.09	4.28	4.37	4.7
			the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	697/1583		3.91	4.19	4.31	4.3
	-	-	te to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	553/1532		3.61	4.01	4.10	4.3
			bute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1504			4.05	4.29	5.
		system clearly	-	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.71	259/1612		3.96	4.16	4.27	4.
в. ноw many	y times '	was class cance	Ilea	0	U	U	0	U	3	4	4.5/	1087/1635	4.57	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.
		Discuss	ion														
l. Did clas	ss discu	ssions contribu	te to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	3.81	4.07	4.22	4.
			ouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391		3.90	4.30	4.47	4.
		_	air and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	571/1388		4.01	4.28	4.49	4.
. Were spe	ecial te	chniques succes	sful	3	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.42	3.93	4.01	3.
		Laborat	ory														
. Did the	lab inc	rease understan	ding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	3.99	4.10	4.43	* *
. Were you	u provid	ed with adequat	e background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.00	4.11	3.96	5
	able for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.23	5		
1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance					0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 215		3.93	4.35	4.72	5
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	3.99	4.18	4.74	5
		Seminar															
	_	_	to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	52/ 85	4.50	4.67	4.58	4.58	4.
			or individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82		4.70	4.52	4.74	4 .
	_	-	te to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1		53/ 78		4.40	4.47	4.52	4.
_			o what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	44/ 80		4.70	4.47	4.50	4.
. Were cri	iteria f	or grading made	clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 82	4.50	4.70	4.16	4.37	4 .
		Field W															
	_		e to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	45/ 52		2.75	4.04	3.64	2.
_	_	_	r evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 53		4.63	4.05	4.03	4
			or consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	1		28/ 42		4.63	4.75	4.78	4
	-	-	ss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 37		4.63	4.58	4.33	4
. Did conf	rerences	nelp you carry	out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	Τ	4.50	17/ 32	4.50	4.63	4.56	4.59	4
		Self P	aced														
			te to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	29/ 50		4.63	4.45	4.39	4
			the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.50	5
_			structor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 43		5.00	4.69	4.61	5
. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful				5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32		5.00	4.37	4.31	5
. Were there enough proctors for all the students				5	1	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	*
Fre					Dis	trib	ution	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
															N '		
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					Re	quir	ea id	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	r	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	
4 150									3								

Electives

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

I 0 Other 6 ? 0

Course-Section: ENME 662 0101 University of Maryland Title LINEAR VIBRATIONS

Baltimore County

Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 15

FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Page 834

Student Course Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------------------	---------------

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 2 7 6 4.27 880/1639 4.27 3.89 4.27 4.42 4.27 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 6 6 4.13 981/1639 4.13 3.96 4.22 4.26 4.13 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 574/1397 4.47 4.09 4.28 4.37 4.47 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 4 4 3 3.67 1324/1583 3.67 3.91 4.19 4.31 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 3 1 0 3 4 3.36 1317/1532 3.36 3.61 4.01 4.10 3.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 990/1504 3.83 3.93 4.05 4.29 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 1 0 4.40 947/1518 4.40 4.23 4.43 4.49 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 0.25 1281/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 2 1 3 0 3.25 1281/1391 3.25 3.90 4.30 4.30 4.47 3.25
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 6 4.27 880/1639 4.27 3.89 4.27 4.42 4.27 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 6 6 4.13 981/1639 4.13 3.96 4.22 4.26 4.13 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 574/1397 4.47 4.09 4.28 4.37 4.47 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 4 4 3 3.67 1324/1583 3.67 3.91 4.19 4.31 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 3 1 0 3 4 3.36 1317/1532 3.36 3.61 4.01 4.10 3.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 990/1504 3.83 3.93 4.05 4.29 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 7. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 2 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.73 4.24 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 0.3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 6 6 4.13 981/1639 4.13 3.96 4.22 4.26 4.13 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 574/1397 4.47 4.09 4.28 4.37 4.47 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 4 4 3 3.67 1324/1583 3.67 3.91 4.19 4.31 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 3 1 0 3 4 3.36 1317/1532 3.36 3.61 4.01 4.10 3.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 990/1504 3.83 3.93 4.05 4.29 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 10 4.40 947/1518 4.40 4.23 4.43 4.49 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 0.3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 9 4.47 574/1397 4.47 4.09 4.28 4.37 4.47 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 4 4 3 3.67 1324/1583 3.67 3.91 4.19 4.31 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 3 1 0 3 4 3.36 1317/1532 3.36 3.61 4.01 4.10 3.36 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 990/1504 3.83 3.93 4.05 4.29 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 4 4 3 3.67 1324/1583 3.67 3.91 4.19 4.31 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 3 1 0 3 4 3.36 1317/1532 3.36 3.61 4.01 4.10 3.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 990/1504 3.83 3.93 4.05 4.29 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 3 3 1 0 3 4 3.36 1317/1532 3.36 3.61 4.01 4.10 3.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 990/1504 3.83 3.93 4.05 4.29 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 2 3 2 5 3.83 990/1504 3.83 3.93 4.05 4.29 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 10 4.40 947/1518 4.40 4.23 4.43 4.49 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 0.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 2 6 5 3.93 1135/1612 3.93 3.96 4.16 4.27 3.93 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 2 2 10 4.40 947/1518 4.40 4.23 4.43 4.49 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 11 4.73 913/1635 4.73 4.74 4.65 4.81 4.73 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 0 1 0 8 2 4.00 889/1579 4.00 3.70 4.08 4.17 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 2 2 10 4.40 947/1518 4.40 4.23 4.43 4.49 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Discussion 6. Discussion 7. O 1 2 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. O 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 7. Solve Tios 1.17 1.08 7. The subject 1. The subj
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 2 2 10 4.40 947/1518 4.40 4.23 4.43 4.49 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 12 4.73 925/1520 4.73 4.27 4.70 4.79 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 1 0 5 7 4.14 990/1517 4.14 3.87 4.27 4.32 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 3 0 2 8 4.15 982/1550 4.15 3.73 4.22 4.23 4.15 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7 1 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.57 3.55 3.94 3.95 3.57 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 1 3 1 3.13 1252/1398 3.13 3.81 4.07 4.22 3.13
·
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 4 2 3 3.89 1043/1388 3.89 4.01 4.28 4.49 3.89
4. Were special techniques successful 7 4 2 0 1 1 0 2.25 934/958 2.25 3.42 3.93 4.01 2.25
Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** 3.99 4.10 4.43 ****
Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 53 **** 4.63 4.05 4.03 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 4.63 4.75 4.78 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 37 **** 4.63 4.58 4.33 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 13 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 32 **** 4.63 4.56 4.59 ****
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 2 A 6 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 6 Major 9 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 9 Non-major 6
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0
Grad. 6 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough

Other

10

Ρ

I

0

0

CONTINUUM MECHANICS

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 835 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General			_		_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	4		1068/1639	4.10	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	684/1639	4.40	3.96	4.22	4.26	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	342/1397	4.70	4.09	4.28	4.37	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	640/1583	4.38	3.91	4.19	4.31	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1 2	3	4	4.38	469/1532	4.38	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1 1	6 9	4.44	,		3.93	4.05	4.29	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0 1	0	0	0	0	6	3		113/1612	4.90	3.96	4.16	4.27	4.90 4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3 4		1288/1635 569/1579		4.74 3.70	4.65 4.08	4.81 4.17	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	U	1	4	4	4.33	509/15/9	4.33	3.70	4.00	4.1/	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.27	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	371/1517	4.70	3.87	4.27	4.32	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	638/1550	4.50	3.73	4.22	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	346/1295	4.40	3.55	3.94	3.95	4.40
Discussion		_		_		_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	708/1398	4.14	3.81	4.07	4.22	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.67	3.90	4.30	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.01	4.28	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	3.42	3.93	4.01	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	3.99	4.10	4.43	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.00	4.11	3.96	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 219	5.00	4.23	4.44	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	3.93	4.35		5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 198	5.00	3.99	4.18		5.00
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.67	4.58	4.58	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.70	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.40	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.70	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.70	4.16	4.37	5.00
Field Work														
	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 52	E 00	2.75	1 01	2 61	E 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0							5.00		4.04	3.64	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.63	4.05	4.03	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6 6	1	0	0	0	0	3 4	5.00	1/ 42 1/ 37	5.00	4.63	4.75	4.78	5.00 5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 3/		4.63 4.63	4.58	4.33	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	O	Т	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.03	4.56	4.33	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.63	4.45	4.39	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 32		5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 21	5.00		4.52	4.42	5.00

Title CONTINUUM MECHANICS

Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 835 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	ned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 812E 0101 University of Maryland Title

ELECTROMECHANIC ENERGY

Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6 Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 836 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean				
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	ı gain new	insights,ski		n this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	814/1639	4.33	3.89	4.27	4.42	4.33
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	948/1639		3.96	4.22	4.26	4.17
		stions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1318/1397	3.33	4.09	4.28	4.37	3.33
4. Did oth	ner evalua	tions reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	3.91	4.19	4.31	3.67
5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1184/1532	3.60	3.61	4.01	4.10	3.60
6. Did wri	itten assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.93	4.05	4.29	3.75
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1399/1612	3.50	3.96	4.16	4.27	3.50
	-	as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1415/1635		4.74	4.65	4.81	4.17
9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1133/1579	3.80	3.70	4.08	4.17	3.80
		Lecture	-															
		tor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.50
		or seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	- ,		4.27	4.70	4.79	4.83
		_		kplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2			1083/1517		3.87	4.27	4.32	4.00
		contribute to		•	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.33	,		3.73	4.22	4.23	4.33
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	806/1295	3.80	3.55	3.94	3.95	3.80
1. Did cla	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.81	4.07	4.22	3.00				
		_	_	d to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	0		1265/1391		3.90	4.30	4.47	3.33
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage	fair and	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.01	4.28	4.49	4.00
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provide	ed with adequat	te back	ground information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.00	4.11	3.96	****
		Semina	r															
3. Did res	search pro	jects contrib	ute to v	what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.40	4.47	4.52	****
4. Did pre	esentation	s contribute	to what	you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.70	4.47	4.50	***
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.70	4.16	4.37	***
		Field W	Work															
4. To what	t degree c	ould you disc	uss you	evaluations	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.63	4.58	4.33	***
				Frequ	ency.	Dist	crib	ution	า									
a 1'. =	1	Cum. GPA			_			_					_					
Credits Ea	arned 	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				ТУ	pe 			Majors			
00-27								ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	or	3
28-55																		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	3
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -				_	h
P 0												2	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
I 0						Otł	ner					3						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: ENME 813F 0101 University of Maryland Title MICRO FLUID MECHANICS Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 837

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1546/1639	3.33	3.89	4.27	4.42	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1536/1639	3.33	3.96	4.22	4.26	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1393/1397	2.67	4.09	4.28	4.37	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	3.91	4.19	4.31	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.61	4.01	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1471/1504	2.67	3.93	4.05	4.29	2.67
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	2	0	1	0		1571/1612	2.67	3.96	4.16	4.27	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1001/1635	4.67	4.74	4.65	4.81	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1565/1579	2.33	3.70	4.08	4.17	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1481/1518	3.00	4.23	4.43	4.49	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1414/1520	4.00	4.27	4.70	4.79	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1453/1517	3.00	3.87	4.27	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1440/1550	3.00	3.73	4.22	4.23	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.55	3.94	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	Ω	Ο	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.81	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.90	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	3.42	3.93	4.01	3.00

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