Course-Section: ENME 204 0101

Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: MILLER, JAMES

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 819 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.14	4.28	4.29	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	885/1648	4.27	4.06	4.23	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	8	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	254/1595	4.73	4.09	4.20	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	966/1533	3.86	3.60	4.04	4.04	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	808/1512	4.13	3.98	4.10	4.14	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	883/1623	4.20	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1268/1646	4.43	4.79	4.69	4.63	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	571/1621	4.36	3.89	4.06	4.01	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	1435/1572	4.14	4.57	4.70	4.73	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	620/1564	4.54	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	994/1559	4.21	3.95	4.29	4.33	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	650/1352	4.08	3.87	3.98	4.07	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.56	4.08	3.99	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.97	4.29	4.19	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.95	4.30	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.03	3.95	3.89	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 221	4.60	4.18	4.16	4.45	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	210/ 243	3.50	3.88	4.12	4.47	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	156/ 212	4.00	4.14	4.40	4.62	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	172/ 209	3.75	3.99	4.35		3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	470/ 555	3.50	4.55	4.29	4.33	3.50
Seminar				_										
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	0	1	0	2	0		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85			4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11 11	1 1	0 0	0 1	0 0	0 1	3 1	5.00	****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	****	4.43 4.35	3.67 5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50		3.68	3.65	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	Τ	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	31/ 288	4.50	4.27	3.08	3.05	4.50
Field Work		0	0	0	0	-	4	0 55	44/ 50	0 55	0 85	4 06	2 02	0 55
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	44/ 52	2.75	2.75	4.06	3.93	2.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 48	***	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12 11	1 1	0	0	1 2	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	TT	Τ	U	U	2	U	1	3.67	****/ 312	***	4.36	3.68	3.59	^^^
Self Paced			_	•	•				44 /			4 06	4 0=	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	41/ 53	3.80	3.80	4.30	4.07	3.80
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	2	0	0		****/ 41 ****/ 24	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	, 21			4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	3.72	

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101

Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: MILLER, JAMES

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 15

MILLER, UAMES

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 819 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 220 0101

Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS

Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,

Enrollment: 77

Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 820 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	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	4	17	49	4.64	459/1649		4.14	4.28	4.29	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	22	43	4.53	533/1648		4.06	4.23	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	19	43	4.43	641/1375		4.22	4.27	4.37	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	1	0	3	17	24	4.40	636/1595		4.09	4.20	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	12	20	30	4.20	673/1533		3.60	4.04	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	380/1512		3.98	4.10	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	18	48	4.61	382/1623		3.88	4.16	4.21	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	69	5.00	1/1646		4.79	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	18	41	4.55	339/1621	4.55	3.89	4.06	4.01	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	7	57	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	64	4.97	237/1572		4.57	4.70	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	11	23	29	4.25	939/1564		4.01	4.28	4.27	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	11	15	37	4.32	911/1559		3.95	4.29	4.33	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	15	1	3	11	12	22	4.04	667/1352		3.87		4.07	4.04
5. Did dudiovibual coomingues cimanee jour understanding	Ü	13	_	3			22	1.01	00771332	1.01	3.07	3.70	1.07	1.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	778/1384	4.06	3.56	4.08	3.99	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	934/1382	4.06	3.97	4.29	4.19	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	832/1368	4.28	3.95	4.30	4.21	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	52	11	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 243	****	2 00	1 10	1 17	****
	69	0	0	0	0	1	-		, -		3.88	4.12	4.47	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	U	U	U	0	36	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work		_												
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52		2.75	4.06	3.93	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	0	0	10	1		****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	3.72	****
5. Were energy proceeds for all the beateness	33	Ü	Ü	o	Ü	10	_	1.05	, 110		1.12	3.55	3.72	
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	des Reason								Ty	ne			Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	43
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	9	C	17	General	0	Under-grad	70	Non-major	27
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	54	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101

Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER

Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 43

Fall 2008

Page 821 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	15	23	4.40	789/1649	4.40	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	15	15	3.98	1155/1648	3.98	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	10	12	20	4.24	823/1375	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	0	3	12	16	4.21	865/1595	4.21	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	11	7	15	4.06	781/1533	4.06	3.60	4.04	4.05	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	817/1512	4.13	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	17	16	4.05	1009/1623	4.05	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	18	17	4.41	511/1621	4.41	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	13	27	4.56	791/1568	4.56	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	414/1572	4.93	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	17	18		1010/1564		4.01	4.28	4.25	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	5	12	21		1010/1504	4.19	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	4	7	13	15	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	U	-	,	13	13	1.00	000/1332	4.00	3.07	3.70	3.71	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	34	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	2	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 221	****	4.18	4.16	4 07	****
9		0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 243	****			4.07 3.89	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39 39	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 212	****	3.88 4.14	4.12 4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 209	****	3.99	4.40	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	228/ 555	4.90	4.55	4.33	4.12	4.90
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearly specified	21	2	U	U		U	10	4.50	220/ 333	4.50	4.55	4.29	1.22	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	2	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	1	0	0	0	6	2		****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****
1. 11. Sometimes help for early out field desivities	J 1	_	3	3	J	J		1.23	, 512		1.50	2.00	2.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	****/ 110	***	4.42	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101

Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER

Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 821 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	12
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	32	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 301H 0101

Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER

Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 822 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

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

Frequencies

Instructor

								cque	TCTES			TIID	CIUCCOI	000100	. nebr	00	пелет	500
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea		
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vou	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	844/1649	4.36	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.3
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.2
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.2
1. Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.3
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	465/1533	4.42	3.60	4.04	4.05	4.4
5. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	627/1512	4.31	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.3
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.0
B. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	748/1646	4.86	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.8
. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	428/1621	4.46	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.4
		Lectur	е															
. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.5
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2			715/1572			4.70	4.64	
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5			833/1564			4.28	4.25	
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	3	2			804/1559			4.29	4.23	
				our understanding	1	2	0	1	2	4			690/1352				3.97	
		-	_		_	_	-	_	_	_	_		,					
Did ala	agg digg	Discus		what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	2	1	2 57	1051/1384	3 57	3.56	4.08	4.11	3 6
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2			899/1382			4.29	4.37	
					7	0	0	0	2	3			948/1368	4.00		4.30	4.39	
	d the instructor encourage fair and open discussi			d open discussion	7	3	0	0	0	4			431/ 948				4.00	
. Were br	peciai e	al techniques successful				3	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	1.00	131, 310	1.00	1.05	3.75	1.00	1.0
		Labora	-	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	****/ 555	++++	4 55	4 20	4 22	+++
. were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts ci	early specified	12	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	****/ 555		4.55	4.29	4.22	
		Semina								_								
. Were ci	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear		10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 288	4.75	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.7
		Field																
. Did cor	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	***
		Self																
. Were th	here eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	he students	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	12/ 110	4.67	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.6
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Per	anir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		1101	datt.	ca I	or Ma	، ــ ت	_		Gradati	_	J	r.ia J	<i>-</i>	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		001	u	_				-	0.1.dC1 9.	1	-	1,011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E1	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enous	πh
2244.	J	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		- 11						-	response					
				I O		O+1	her				1	1	_ CDPOID		91			

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR

Enrollment: 23
Ouestionnaires: 15

VONKERCZEK, CHR Fall 2008

Page 823 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				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	3	3	5	4	3.67	1429/1649	3.75	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	3		1262/1648	3.49	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	665/1375	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	2	3.53	1389/1595	3.39	4.09	4.20	4.21	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	5	3	4	0	2.77	1492/1533	2.73	3.60	4.04	4.05	2.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	2	4	2	3.00	1428/1512	3.15	3.98	4.10	4.11	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1405/1623	3.23	3.88	4.16	4.08	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	7	0	3.43	1393/1621	3.21	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	6	4	3.79	1391/1568	4.01	4.36	4.43	4.39	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	8		1241/1572	4.43	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	4	3	2		1480/1564	3.15	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	5	2		1432/1559	3.38	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1270/1352				3.97	2.80
_, ,														
Discussion			_		_	•						4 00		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2 2	2	2 1	0	0		1366/1384	2.55	3.56	4.08	4.11	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2 1	1	0	1		1370/1382	2.66	3.97	4.29	4.37	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	9 9	4	∠ 1	1	U T	1	U T		1339/1368 ****/ 948	2.74	3.95 4.03	4.30	4.39	2.67 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	Τ	Τ	U	U	U	1.50	***/ 948	***	4.03	3.95	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	178/ 221	3.58	4.18	4.16	4.07	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	220/ 243	3.20	3.88	4.12	3.89	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	156/ 212	3.93	4.14	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	169/ 209	3.60	3.99	4.35	4.12	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	467/ 555	3.60	4.55	4.29	4.22	3.55
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	36/ 288	4.43	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.60
Field Work														
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 312	4.38	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.75
		•	J	J	Ü	-		1	11, 512	1.00	1.55	3.00	2.00	1.75
Self Paced														

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 110 4.75 4.42 3.99 4.05 ****

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

Course-Section: ENME 303 0102

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 824 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new in:	sights,skills from	this course	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1376/164	9 3.75	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.75
2. Did the instructor	_	-	0	0	0	4	5	2	1	3.00	1591/164	3.49	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam question	_	-	0	0	0	0	3	6			950/137		4.22		4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluation	_	-	0	1	0	3	4	3			1504/159		4.09	4.20	4.21	3.18
Did assigned reading	-	-	0	5	0	4	2	1	0		1504/153		3.60		4.05	2.57
6. Did written assignme			0	1	1	2	5	3			1459/151		3.98		4.11	
7. Was the grading syst		ed	0	0	2	4	3	1			1579/162		3.88	4.16	4.08	2.75
8. How many times was			0	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/164		4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade	the overall teachi	ng effectiveness	1	0	0	3	4	4	0	3.09	1489/162	1 3.21	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.09
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor	's lectures well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1279/156	8 4.01	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor s	seem interested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1365/157	2 4.43	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.33
3. Was lecture material	l presented and exp	lained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	1	1	2.91	1520/156	4 3.15	4.01	4.28	4.25	2.91
4. Did the lectures con	ntribute to what yo	u learned	1	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1389/155	9 3.38	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.45
5. Did audiovisual tech	nniques enhance you	r understanding	3	5	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	1347/135	2 2.52	3.87	3.98	3.97	1.75
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussion		at vou learned	8	0	2	0	1	1	Ο	2 25	1357/138	4 2.55	3.56	4.08	4.11	2.25
2. Were all students as		-	8	0	1	1	2	0			1372/138		3.97	4.29	4.37	2.25
			8	0	1	0	2	1			1331/136		3.95	4.30	4.39	2.75
	id the instructor encourage fair and open discuss: ere special techniques successful				0	0	1	0			****/ 94		4.03		4.00	****
1 5'1'.	Laboratory		_	0	•	•	2	0	_	2 40	000/00	1 2 50	4 10	4 16	4 00	2 40
1. Did the lab increase	_		7	0	0	0	3	2		3.40	200/ 22		4.18	4.16	4.07	3.40
2. Were you provided w			7 7	0 0	1 0	1 1	2 1	1 1		2.60	239/ 24		3.88		3.89	2.60
 Were necessary mater Did the lab instruct 			7	0	1	0	2	2		3.80	183/ 21 206/ 20		4.14 3.99		4.21	
5. Were requirements for			5	0	1	1	2	0	-		477/55				4.12	
J. Were requirements in	or lab reports trea	ily specified	5	U	1		2	U	3	3.43	477/ 33	3.00	4.55	4.20	1.22	3.43
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria for g	rading made clear		11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	8 4.43	4.27	3.68	3.58	****
	Field Work															
5. Did conferences help		ld activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 31	2 4.38	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.00
•	•															
	Self Paced			•			•	_	_						4 0=	4 ==
5. Were there enough p	roctors for all the	students	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	11/ 11	0 4.75	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.75
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Pos	sons				Th-	уре			Majors	
				Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradua	te	0	Majo	r	12
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 10			C						0	IIm al a a	~~~d .	1.0	NT	ma +	0
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0				Ger	neral	-				U	Under-	grau .	L2	non-	major	0
	.50-4.00 2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
		P 0										ses to 1			_	
P 0				0+1					- 1	2						

Other

12

I

0

0

Course-Section: ENME 303 0103

Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 825 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

			Fre	equer		s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	Ω	0	2	4	1	6	3 85	1319/1649	3.75	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	3		1441/1648		4.06	4.23	4.18	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31			4.22	4.27	4.22	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	2	4		1416/1595		4.09	4.20	4.21	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	1	0	2		1483/1533		3.60	4.04	4.05	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	4	4		1246/1512		3.98	4.10	4.11	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	0	5	4		1405/1623		3.88	4.16	4.08	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	11		1/1646		4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	2	5	0	3.10	1488/1621			4.06	4.02	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1137/1568	4.01	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	7		1273/1572		4.57	4.70	4.64	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	3	2	4		1431/1564		4.01	4.28	4.25	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	2	5		1412/1559		3.95	4.29	4.23	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	1	1	1		1219/1352		3.87	3.98		3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	1	2	2 40	1100/1204	2 55	2 56	4 00	4.11	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	1 2	∠ 1		1122/1384 1233/1382		3.56 3.97	4.08	4.11	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	1	1		1326/1368			4.29	4.37	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 948	∠./ 1 ****	4.03	3.95	4.00	∠.OU ****
i. Wele special techniques successful		3	Ü	Ü	Ü	O	2	3.00	, 510		1.05	3.75	1.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	- ,		4.18	4.16	4.07	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	155/ 243		3.88	4.12	3.89	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	156/ 212		4.14	4.40	4.21	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	3	2	3		151/ 209	3.60	3.99	4.35	4.12	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	442/ 555	3.60	4.55	4.29	4.22	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	***	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.43	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.25
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.38	4.36	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.75	4.42	3.99	4.05	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	tribi	ution	า									

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	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	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101

35

MACHINE DESIGN

FARQUHAR, TONY

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 17

Page 826 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1 Did vo	u dain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	7	5	4	3 65	1443/1649	3.65	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.65
		tor make clear			0	0	1	1	7	5	_		1494/1648	3.47	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.47
		estions reflec			0	0	1	2	4	6			1176/1375		4.22		4.22	3.59
		ations reflect			0	6	0	3	4	2			1487/1595		4.09	4.20	4.21	3.27
				what you learned	0	6	2	2	3	2			1441/1533		3.60		4.05	3.00
	_	-		o what you learned	0	8	2	1	1	3			1387/1512		3.98		4.11	3.22
		system clearl		-	0	0	3	6	3	-			1562/1623		3.88	4.16	4.08	2.88
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	-			398/1646		4.79	4.69	4.67	4.94
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	7				1412/1621		3.89		4.02	
		Lectur	_															
1 1/2 +1	b				2	0	0	1	4	_	1	2 07	1262/1560	2 07	1 20	1 12	4 20	2 07
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	1	4	6 6			1362/1568		4.36 4.57	4.43	4.39	3.87
		ctor seem inter			2	0	-	-	3 7	-			1419/1572				4.64	4.20
	s lecture material presented and explained clearly d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					-	0	2	•	3			1403/1564		4.01	4.28	4.25	3.47
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	1	1	4	6			1344/1559	3.60	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.60
5. Did au	.diovisual	. techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	2	12	1	0	1	0	Τ	3.00	****/1352	****	3.87	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus																
1. Did cl	d class discussions contribute to what you learne						1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1341/1384	2.60	3.56	4.08	4.11	2.60
2. Were a	re all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.97	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did th	ere all students actively encouraged to participate id the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1071/1368	3.80	3.95	4.30	4.39	3.80
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	_		15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	***
		Field	īvī a sala															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	6	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	39/ 312	4.36	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.36
			-															
E Ware t	horo onou	Self agh proctors fo		ho atudonta	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.50	17/ 110	4 50	1 12	2 00	4 05	4 50
J. WEIE C.	ilere ellou	ign proceors ro	I all ti	ne students	11	U	U	U	U	3	J	4.50	1// 110	4.50	7.72	3.99	4.05	1.50
			Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trib	ution	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	5	
00-27	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9								 or M	ajors		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		re(JUTT (Lu I	J⊥ 1*1¢	מ בייי ני ג	,	J	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	/_	14
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Co	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gei	c.a.	-				J	onder -g	Luu 1	•	14011) U I	J
Grad.							ectiv	769				0	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
JI aa.	0	P 0		11.11	CI	v CD				J	respons				_	J		
	I O										1	.0	T CPPOIIS	CD CO L	c bigi	udl.		
				? 2		OLI	her				_	. 0						

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101 University of Maryland Title FLUID MECHANICS Instructor: CARMI, SHLOMO

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Enrollment: 43

Questionnaires: 23

Page 827 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	-			
Ctudant	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Ougetion	סמוכמו

	Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	eque:	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructo: Rar		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Conomo																	
1 Did you	u dain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	736/1	1649	4.11	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.43
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	10	8		1032/1		3.98	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.13
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52			4.29	4.22	4.27	4.22	
		ations reflect			0	13	0	0	4	2	4		1067/1		3.92	4.09	4.20	4.21	
				what you learned	1	4	0	3	4	8	3		1173/1		3.45	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.61
	_	_		o what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	8	7		553/1		4.19	3.98	4.10	4.11	
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	7	9	7		1029/1		4.12	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.00
		was class canc		inea	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00		1646	4.71	4.79	4.69	4.67	
	-			hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	14	1		1114/1					4.02	
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	652/1	1568	4.16	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.65
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	1	1	6	15		1222/1		4.23	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.52
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	12			1362/1		3.60	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.59
		s contribute t			1	0	1	2	4	4			1121/1		3.71	3.95	4.29		4.00
				our understanding	1	9	0	1	6	5	1		1069/1		3.59	3.87	3.98	3.97	
J. Dia aa	aiovibaai	. cccimiques en	nance y	our underscanding	-		0	-	Ü	5	_	3.10	1005/	1332	3.33	3.07	3.70	3.57	3.10
1 5'1 1		Discus			1.0	0		-	0	-	0	1 65	1005/	1 2 0 4	1 68	2 56	4 00	4 11	1 68
				what you learned	17	0	4	1	0	1			1375/1		1.67		4.08		1.67
				d to participate	17	0	1	1	1	1	2		1251/1		3.33	3.97	4.29	4.37	3.33
	the instructor encourage fair and open discusse special techniques successful				17	0	1	1	1	1			1229/1		3.33	3.95	4.30	4.39	3.33
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		17	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****
	Laboratory																		
5. Were re	Laboratory e requirements for lab reports clearly specifi			early specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/	555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina																	
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear	•	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****
		Field	Work																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	14	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	53/	312	4.22	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.22
		Self	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	53	***	3.80	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	30	***	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were ye	our conta	cts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	41	***	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the	e feedbac	k/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	24	***	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were the	here enou	gh proctors fo	r all t	he students	19	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/	110	4.60	4.42	3.99	4.05	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	Predits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	s				Тур	oe			Majors	;
00-27 28-55						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	or	16
56-83						Cer	nera	1				0	IInda	er-gi	rad ?	3	Non-	-major	7
84-150						Gel	LCIA	-				5	JIIde	cr - 91	Luu Z		MOII	a JUI	,
Grad.						ភ ា 4	ecti [.]	VAC				0	###	± _ 1	Means t	here =	re not	enous	rh
Ji aa.	J	3.30 1.00	J	P 0		11.1						5			es to b			_	,
						O+1	her				2	:1	rest	PO1196	נו טיי פיי	C DIGI	ıııcaı	10	
	I 0 ? 1						TCT				2	. т							
			; T																

Course-Section: ENME 320 0201

Title FLUID MECHANICS

Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 828 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	8	5	3.78	1366/1649	4.11	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	7	6		1287/1648	3.98	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	10	5	4.06	932/1375	4.29		4.27	4.22	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	0	8	3	3.85	1236/1595	3.92	4.09	4.20	4.21	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	4	1	2	5	3.29	1354/1533	3.45	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	883/1512	4.19	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	838/1623	4.12	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1277/1646	4.71	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1429/1621	3.59	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1426/1568	4.16	4.36	4.43	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	1480/1572	4.23	4.57	4.70	4.64	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	4	4	6	3.61	1356/1564	3.60	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	4	5	3.41	1404/1559	3.71	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	935/1352	3.59	3.87	3.98	3.97	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1384	1.67	3.56	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1382	3.33	3.97	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1368	3.33	3.95	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	***	4.03	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	3.89	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****		4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 312	4.22	4.36	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced				•	•	•	_		= -			4 06	4 06	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.32	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	14/ 110	4.60	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.60

Course-Section: ENME 320 0201
Title FLUID MECHANICS
Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN

22

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 828 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101

Title TRANSFER PROCESSES

Instructor: ZHU, LIANG

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 22

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 829 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		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	2	7	13	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	452/1648	4.59	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	334/1375	4.73	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	996/1595	4.11	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	935/1533	3.89	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1022/1512	3.90	3.98	4.10	4.11	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	251/1623	4.73	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	664/1646	4.91	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	0	9	10	4.40	511/1621	4.40	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.40
<u>-</u> .														
Lecture			_		_							4 40	4 00	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	840/1572	4.81	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	689/1564	4.48	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	Ţ	0 5	0	2	7	8	9		1045/1559	4.14	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	/	1	6	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.87	3.98	3.97	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	5.00
5. Here requirements for tab reports creatly specified	13	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	o	,	3.00	17 333	3.00	1.33	1.27	1.22	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	***	****	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	****	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														

Frequency Distribution

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 ****/ 110 **** 4.42 3.99 4.05 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0			_		-	
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	21	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332H 0101

Title SOLID MECH & MAT LAB H

Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 830 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	770/1648	4.36	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	641/1375	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	171/1512	4.79	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	994/1623	4.07	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	632/1621	4.31	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	851/1559	4.38	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	432/1352	4.36	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****
Laboratory	_	0	0	•	0	_	_	4 20	02/001	4 20	4 10	1 16	4 00	4 20
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	93/ 221	4.38	4.18	4.16	4.07	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	149/ 243	4.13	3.88	4.12	3.89	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.14	4.40	4.21	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	58/ 209	4.71	3.99	4.35	4.12	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	238/ 555	4.80	4.55	4.29	4.22	4.80
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.25
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.05	***
P		- 5 -1												
Frequ	lency	DIST	tribi	ıtıoı	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	11
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8			_									J .		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 2		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	4
84-150 11 3.00-3.49 5 D 0									3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
I 0		Otl	her				1	1						
2 1														

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101

Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13

PAN, MARC Fall 2008

Page 831 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

I 0

		Questions			NR	NA	Fr 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,skil	ls from	this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	590/1649	4.28	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.55
2. Did the	instruc	tor make clear	the expe	cted goals	2	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1070/1648	3.97	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.09
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	950/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.00
		ations reflect	_	-	2	0	1	0	3	1	6		1067/1595		4.09	4.20		4.00
		adings contribu			2	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	815/1533		3.60	4.04	4.05	4.00
		_		what you learned		0	0	0	0	5		4.55	352/1512		3.98	4.10	4.11	
		system clearly		ed	3	0	1	0	2	5			1299/1623		3.88	4.16	4.08	3.70
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646		4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ld you g	rade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	207/1621	4.47	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.70
		Lecture																
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lectures	well pr	epared	2	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	803/1568	4.77	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.55
		tor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00
		erial presented			2	0	1	0	0	2		4.45	715/1564		4.01	4.28	4.25	4.45
		s contribute to			2	0	0	1	0	6			1016/1559		3.95	4.29		4.18
5. Did aud	iovisual	techniques enh	ance you	r understanding	2	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	482/1352	4.43	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.30
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	id class discussions contribute to what you learn					0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were al	re all students actively encouraged to participa					0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the	re all students actively encouraged to participa d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss					0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****
		Laborat	orv															
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understan	_	the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	56/ 221	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.07	4.57
			_	ound information		0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	121/ 243		3.88	4.12	3.89	4.29
3. Were ne	cessary	materials avail	able for	lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	39/ 212	4.29	4.14	4.40	4.21	4.86
4. Did the	lab ins	tructor provide	assista	nce	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	151/ 209	3.75	3.99	4.35	4.12	4.00
5. Were re	quiremen	ts for lab repo	rts clea	rly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	311/ 555	4.24	4.55	4.29	4.22	4.44
		Seminar																
5. Were cr	iteria f	or grading made	clear		9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.25
		Field W	ork															
5. Did con	ferences	help you carry		ld activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****
		a 16 b	,															
5. Were th	ere enou	Self Pagh proctors for		students	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.17	4.42	3.99	4.05	****
		5 1											,					
	Fr							ution	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 0					Re		ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	10
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5						-			-						3 -		
56-83							nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	3
84-150															_			_
Grad.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					h
		P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			

Other

10

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102

Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 832 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
1 Did vo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	933/1649	4.28	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.29
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	6	5		1021/1648	3.97	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.14
		estions reflect			0	0	1	1	0	6	6		925/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.22	
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	697/1595	4.17	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.36
				what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	2		****/1533	3.80	3.60	4.04	4.05	****
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	380/1512	4.40	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.50
		system clearly			0	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	780/1623	3.88	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.29
		was class cance	_	inca	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	7		428/1621				4.02	
J. 110W WO	dia you gi	rade the overa.	LI CEACI	ing effectiveness	1	U	U	U	1	J	,	1.10	420/1021	1.1/	3.05	4.00	1.02	1.10
		Lecture	3															
	he instru		1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	196/1568	4.77	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.92		
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained cle					0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was le						0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	537/1564	4.47	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.62
4. Did th	d the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	749/1559	4.21	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.46
5. Did au	oid audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	1	1	4	5	4.18	565/1352	4.43	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.18
		Laborat																
1 Did th	e lah ing	rease understa	-	the material	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 221	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.07	4.00
				ground information	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 243	4.10	3.88	4.12	3.89	4.50
				or lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	2		4.50		4.29	4.14	4.40	4.21	
		tructor provide			10	1	0	0	1	2	0		****/ 209		3.99	4.35	4.12	****
				early specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67			4.55	4.29	4.22	
	_																	
Г 1/Jana ж		Semina			12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 288	4 25	4 07	2 60	2 50	++++
5. Were C	illella l	or grading made	e Clear		12	U	U	U	U	1		4.50	/ 200	4.25	4.2/	3.00	3.30	
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for		ne students	10	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.17	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.00
							2 1		_									
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribi	utioi	1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	A 0		Per	ากเราะ	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	13		
28-55						vec	1u11	LU L	JI Md	ודטנ	U	J	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC) <u> </u>	13
56-83	0	B 10 C 4		Cer	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	4	Mon	-major	1		
84-150	7	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	D 0		Gei	тста.	_				U	onder -g	Luu 1		INOII	a JUI	Ψ.	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		ក 1∠	ectiv	769				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh	
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	3	P 0		T- T- C	-C L I	v CD				U	respons					11
				I O		Otł	ner				1	3	T CPPOIIS	CD CO L	c bigi	cai		
				5 U		OCI	ICI					J						
				: U														

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103

Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2008

Page 833 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							_	ncies		_		tructor		Dept			Sect	
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4 		Mean	Rank 	меап 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1183/1649	4.28	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.00
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1408/1648	3.97	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.67
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1259/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.22	3.33
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.17
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1180/1533	3.80	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.60
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	782/1512	4.40	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.17
7. Was th	ne grading	system clearl	y explain	ied	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1318/1623	3.88	3.88	4.16	4.08	3.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.47	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.25
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	344/1568	4.77	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.83
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1564	4.47	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.33
4. Did th	ne lecture	u learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1121/1559	4.21	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.00		
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	r understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1352	4.43	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.80	
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were a	all studen	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	***	4.03	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understa	nding of	the material	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	208/ 221	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.07	3.25
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequa	te backgr	ound information	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	210/ 243	4.10	3.88	4.12	3.89	3.50
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable for	lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	198/ 212	4.29	4.14	4.40	4.21	3.50
4. Did th	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assista	ince	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	186/ 209	3.75	3.99	4.35	4.12	3.50
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts clea	rly specified	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	464/ 555	4.24	4.55	4.29	4.22	3.60
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out fie	eld activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	4.36	3.68	3.60	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors fo	r all the	students	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	24/ 110	4.17	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.33
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 0	0.00-0.99	A 1					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo		 5	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	В 3		Ket	4u116	-u 1(J⊥ 1*10	יוטר צ	,	J	Graduat	_	J	ria JC) <u>+</u>	5	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	1	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	јh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					4						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101 Title

AUTOMATIC CONTROLS

Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 834 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eane	ncie	S		Tns	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	11	3	26	21	5		1594/1649	3.09	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	16	24	17		1375/1648	3.71	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	14	23	23	3.95	992/1375	3.95	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	12	5	13	12	7		1548/1595	2.94	4.09	4.20	4.36	2.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	5	5	7	20	17		1093/1533	3.72	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	20	7	14	9	5		1494/1512	2.49	3.98	4.10	4.26	2.49
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	17	19	11	13		1509/1623	3.15	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	1	63			4.95	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	14	7	26	6	2	2.55	1583/1621	2.55	3.89	4.06	4.24	2.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	5	5	17	17	19	3.63	1433/1568	3.63	4.36	4.43	4.54	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	10	12	21	14	7		1563/1572	2.94	4.57	4.70	4.79	2.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	6	13	20	18	6		1491/1564	3.08	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	20	8	19	8	7		1524/1559	2.58	3.95	4.29	4.41	2.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	47	7	2	1	3	-		****/1352	****	3.87	3.98	4.07	****
··									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	59	0	4	0	3	0	2	2.56	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	1	5	0	2		****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	59	0	1	2	4	0	2		****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	59	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.31	****
T. Armet ann														
Laboratory	6 F	0	•	0	-	•	0	2 00	**** (001	****	4 10	4 16	4 50	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 221		4.18	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 212	****	4.14	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67 44	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 209		3.99	4.35	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	U	U	U	1	U	23	4.92	205/ 555	4.92	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39		****	4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	67	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	0	12	4	4.12	37/ 110	4.12	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.12
- -														

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101 Title

AUTOMATIC CONTROLS

Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL

Enrollment: 79 Questionnaires: 68 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 834 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	35	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	64
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	12	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	4
84-150	38	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	61	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 409 0101 University of Maryland Page 835 Title FEB 11, 2009

MECH: DEFORMABLE SOLID Baltimore County Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR Fall 2008

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	743/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	4.38
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375		4.22	4.27	4.48	4.63
		ations reflect			0	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1067/1595		4.09	4.20	4.36	4.00
				what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.67
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.50
		g system clearly			0	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1485/1623	3.25	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.25
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	714/1646	4.88	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.88
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	812/1621	4.14	3.89	4.06	4.24	4.14
1 Wome +	Lecture e the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	1	_	2	1 12	1220/1568	4.13	4.36	4.43	1 E1	4.13
	the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.13	665/1572		4.57	4.43	4.79	4.13
	lecture material presented and explained clear				0	0	0	0	2	3	-		1064/1564		4.01	4.70	4.40	4.13
	<u> </u>				0	0	0	0	0	4		4.13				4.29		4.13
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				1	4	0	0	1	2		3.67	,		3.87	3.98		
5. Did au	laiovisuai	r techniques em	iance y	our understanding	_	4	U	U	_	4	U	3.07	9/0/1332	3.07	3.07	3.90	4.07	3.07
		Laborat	-															
5. Were r	requiremer	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for		he students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	4.42	3.99	4.22	****
				Floor		- D:	d la-		_									
				Frequ	lency	DIST	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red		ed f	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2						J						5 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				5	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	her					3	-		5			
				? 1														

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101 University of Maryland Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

18

Page 836 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1295/1649	3.93	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	897/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1281/1375	3.42	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	983/1595	4.04	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1533	2.47	3.60	4.04	4.14	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1403/1512	3.83	3.98	4.10	4.26	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	936/1623	3.60	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646		4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1192/1621	3.63	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	2		1321/1572			4.70	4.79	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1344/1559	3.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	879/1352	3.40	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 243		3.88	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212		4.14	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	3.80	3.99	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	252/ 555	4.35	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.75
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work	7	٥	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	60/ 210	1 10	1 26	2 60	2 05	4 00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	/	0	0	0	0	3	U	4.00	68/ 312	4.42	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.00
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 837 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

8

0	1	T1	0
Stuo	ient Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102

20

FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB

EGGLETON, CHARL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

						_	ncies				tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1351/1649	3.93	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.80
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	6	2	2		1448/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	3.60
		estions reflect			0	5	0	0	4	1	0		1296/1375	3.42	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.20
		uations reflect			1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1275/1595	4.04	4.09	4.20	4.36	3.78
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1493/1533	2.47	3.60	4.04	4.14	2.75
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	.bute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	755/1512	3.83	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.20
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	1	6	1	2	3.40	1434/1623	3.60	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.40
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.97	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.90
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	l tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	1415/1621	3.63	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.38
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	the instru	prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.00		
		ctor seem intere		2	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1527/1572	3.96	4.57	4.70	4.79	3.63	
			explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	1			1297/1564		4.01	4.28	4.40	3.75	
		es contribute to	-	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1508/1559	3.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	2.86	
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enh	our understanding	4	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1266/1352	3.40	3.87	3.98	4.07	2.83	
		Laborat	ory															
		crease understar			8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221		4.18	4.16	4.73	****
				ground information	8	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 243		3.88	4.12	4.61	****
				for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 212		4.14	4.40	4.57	****
		structor provide			8	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 209	3.80	3.99	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were r	requiremer	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	349/ 555	4.35	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.29
		Field W																
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry	out f	field activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	27/ 312	4.42	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.60
F	,	Self F			0		0	0	0	-	0	4 00	**** / 110	4.4.4.4.	4 40	2 00	4 00	ale ale ale ale
5. Were t	inere enou	ugh proctors for	all t	ine students	9	0	0	U	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	4.42	3.99	4.22	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0		Rec		ed fo	or Ma	iors	- – – –	0	 Graduat	 е	0	Majc	 or	9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 0	В 5						, ~	-	-	2_ 3.3.300	-	-) •		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 3		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	0	Non-	major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0								-			-		5 2	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons					
				- 0		0.1						•						

Other

I

?

0

0

University of Maryland Page 838
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103

16

FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB

EGGLETON, CHARL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General	-															
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	1	6			1106/1649		4.14		4.50	4.11
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	6			1333/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	3.78
		estions reflect			2	2	0	0	2	2			1087/1375		4.22	4.27	4.48	3.80
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	3			853/1595			4.20	4.36	4.22
	_	-		what you learned	0	4	1	2	2	0			1522/1533		3.60	4.04		2.20
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2			817/1512		3.98	4.10	4.26	4.13
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	1	2	1	2			1485/1623		3.88	4.16	4.27	3.25
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646			4.69		5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	l teacl	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1175/1621	3.63	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.78
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.00		
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem intere	sted in	n the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1502/1572	3.96	4.57	4.70	4.79	3.86
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	l and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1246/1564	3.80	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.86
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1400/1559	3.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.43
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1016/1352	3.40	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.57
		Laborat	orv															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understar		f the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	118/ 221	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.73	4.20
				ground information	4	0	0	0	2	2		3.80	183/ 243		3.88	4.12	4.61	3.80
				or lab activities	5	0	0	2	0	1		3.25	208/ 212		4.14	4.40		3.25
		structor provide			4	0	0	0	2	2		3.80	169/ 209	3.80	3.99	4.35	4.63	3.80
		nts for lab repo			1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	388/ 555			4.29	4.41	4.00
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made			7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	21/ 312	4.42	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.67
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits E		G GD 3		The same of Consider				Das					m				Ma dana	
credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	1	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	8		
28-55	0	В 4																
56-83	1	C 1		Gei	nera!	l				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	1		
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					7						
				3 0														

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101

Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI

Instructor: MILLER, JAMES

Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 839 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions					NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
											Raiik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		General																
		insights,ski			0	0	2	0	0	2	3		1479/1649	3.85	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.57
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	672/1648	4.50	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.43
		estions reflect			0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.65	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.50
		tions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	1	1 1	0		4.29		4.44	4.09	4.20		4.29
	_	_		nat you learned	0	4	-	-	_	0		4.33	,	4.45	3.60	4.04		4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	1 1	1 1	1 1			799/1512		3.98	4.10		4.14
		system clearly as class cance		nea	1	0	1	0 T	0	1			936/1623 1462/1646		3.88 4.79	4.16 4.69		4.14 4.17
	-			ing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	1		4.17	914/1621	4.25	3.89	4.09		4.17
9. HOW WOL	iia you gi	ade the overa.	II teacii.	ing effectiveness	3	1	U	U	1	_	1	4.00	914/1021	4.23	3.09	4.00	4.24	4.00
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			2	0	1	0	0	0			1169/1568		4.36			4.20
		or seem intere			2	0	0	1	0	0			1321/1572		4.57	4.70		4.40
				plained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0		4.40	780/1564	4.52	4.01	4.28		4.40
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	1	0	0	0			1009/1559	4.14	3.95	4.29		4.20
5. Did aud						1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	4.55	3.87	3.98	4.07	5.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.83	3.56	4.08	4.35	5.00
2. Were al	oid class discussions contribute to what you learne Were all students actively encouraged to participat					0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	4.83	3.97	4.29	4.56	5.00
3. Did the	ere all students actively encouraged to participate id the instructor encourage fair and open discussi					0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	4.90	3.95	4.30	4.58	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful		4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.03	3.95	4.31	5.00
		_ ,																
5 Were re	equirement	Laborates for lab repo	-	arly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 555	5 00	4 55	4 29	4.41	****
J. WEIG I	.quii ciiicii	s for tab repo	JICB CIC	arry specified	O	O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	, 555	3.00	1.55	1.20	1.11	
		Semina	=															
5. Were cr	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.27	3.68	3.71	4.00
		Field V	Work															
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.25	4.36	3.68	3.95	****
		- 15																
5. Were th	nere enous	Self I h proctors for		e students	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 110	4.50	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.50
3. 11010 01		JII PIOOCOID IO		5 Students	3	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_	1.50	1,, 110	1.50		3.33		1.50
				Frequ	lency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27						Rec	quire	ed id	or Ma	ıjors	5	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	7
28-55 56-83						Cor	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	0
84-150						361	.c.a.	-				-	onder g.	Laa	,	14011		U
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ıh
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					7	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENME 444 0102

Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI

Instructor: MILLER, JAMES

Enrollment: 17

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

5

Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 840 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did v	rou gain n	ew insights, skil		om this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1096/1649	3.85	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.13
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	487/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	4.56
		uestions reflect			0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375		4.22	4.27		4.80
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	383/1595	4.44	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.60
				what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	4	4.57			3.60	4.04		4.57
	-	-		to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31			3.98	4.10	4.26	4.31
		g system clearly			0	0	2	1	1	4	8		1134/1623		3.88	4.16		3.94
		was class cance			0	0	1	0	1	1	13		1139/1646		4.79	4.69		
	-			ching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	374/1621				4.24	
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	767/1568	4.39	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.57
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93			4.57	4.70	4.79	4.93
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64			4.01	4.28	4.40	4.64
					2	0	1	1	1	4	7		1088/1559		3.95	4.29		4.07
	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				4	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	638/1352			3.98		4.09
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand Discussion				_	_	_	-	_	_	_		,					
1 Did c	olage diec			what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.83	3.56	4.08	4.35	4.67
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382		3.97	4.29	4.56	4.67
				nd open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368		3.95	4.30		4.80
		echniques succes		a open arbeablin	11	2	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 948		4.03	3.95		****
		Laborat	corv															
5. Were	requireme		_	learly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Seminar	2															
5. Were	criteria	for grading made	e clear	£	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	4.27	3.68	3.71	****
		Field W																
5. Did c	onference	s help you carry	out f	field activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.25
		Self F																
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors for	: all t	the students	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	17/ 110	4.50	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.50
			Frequ	ıency	Dist	rib	ution	ı										
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 14		 Red	uir	ed fo	or Ma		 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						,	-	-	2_ 2.2.3.0	-	-) (-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	3
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D 0									5				3	-
			-															

Electives

Other

0

15

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Course-Section: ENME 462 0101
Title INTR ENGR ACOUSTICS

University of Maryland
ICS Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR Enrollment: 46

Enrollment: 46
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 841 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain new	v insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	1076/1649	4.14	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.14
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	672/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	4.43
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52		4.52	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.52
	_	ations reflect			1	7	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	660/1595		4.09	4.20	4.36	4.38
			_	nat you learned	0	3	1	2	5	5	5		1173/1533		3.60	4.04	4.14	3.61
	-	-		what you learned	0	8	0	0	4	2	7		711/1512		3.98	4.10	4.26	4.23
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	2	2	_			720/1623	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.33
		vas class cance			0	0	0	0	0	7	14		1037/1646	4.67	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.67
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	8	8		754/1621		3.89	4.06		4.20
1 Were t	he instruc	Lecture ctor's lectures		renared	1	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.40
		or seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	19		355/1572			4.70	4.79	4.95
					1	0	0	2	2	8	8		1083/1564			4.28	4.40	4.10
	lecture material presented and explained clear the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	1	1	2	7	9		1075/1559	4.10	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.10
					1	10	0	1	1	4	3		690/1352	4.00	3.87		4.07	4.00
5. Did au	alovisual	ar understanding	2	10	U	_		-1	3	4.00	090/1352	4.00	3.07	3.90	4.07	4.00		
		Discus																
		nat you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****		
				to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage :	fair and	open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were s	pecial tec	chniques succes	ssful		17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.31	****
		Labora	- 02077															
5. Were r	equirement		-	arly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.55	4.29	4.41	****
	1	· ·		2									,					
		Semina																
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	e clear		19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****
		Field V	Nork															
5. Did co	nferences			eld activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	****
			•															
- ··		Self			1.0	•	0	0	0	-	0	4 68	**** / 110	ale ale ale ale	4 40	2 00	4 00	de de de de
5. Were t	nere enoug	gh proctors for	r all the	e students	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 110	***	4.42	3.99	4.22	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	18
28-55							_					_						_
56-83							neral	L				7	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	3
84-150	12	D 0											_			_		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101 Title

CONTROLS/VIB LAB

TASCH, URI Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 842 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	1	8	8	4.41	762/1649	4.33	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	556/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	529/1375	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	428/1595		4.09	4.20	4.36	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	2	2	2		1200/1533	3.29	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	366/1512		3.98	4.10	4.26	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	_	12	4.69	296/1623	4.47	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646		4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	1	9	5	4.00	914/1621		3.89	4.06	4.24	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	372/1568	4.74	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	967/1572	4.87	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	854/1564	3.92	4.01	4.28	4.40	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	2	8	3.93	1174/1559	4.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	792/1352	4.46	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory							_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	7		28/ 221	4.72	4.18	4.16	4.73	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	4	1		3.56	204/ 243	4.11	3.88	4.12	4.61	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	2	4		3.78	186/ 212	3.89	4.14	4.40	4.57	3.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	121/ 209	4.19	3.99	4.35	4.63	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	267/ 555	4.73	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.70
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	36/ 312	4.57	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.40
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 110	4.00	4.42	3.99	4.22	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17	=			
				2	Λ						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: TASCH, URI Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 4

Page 843 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions	5		NR	NA		equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5'1		General	=	. 1 . 1	•	•	•	•	-	-	0	4 05	065/1640	4 22	4 1 4	4 00	4 50	4 05
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	2	1 1	1	4.25	965/1649	4.33	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.25
		ctor make clear uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	1347/1648 296/1375	4.13	4.06	4.23	4.36 4.48	3.75 4.75
	_	uestions reflect uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.75	497/1595	4.53	4.22	4.27	4.46	4.75
			_	what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	0	1		1441/1533	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.14	3.00
	_	_		what you learned what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50		4.51	3.98	4.10	4.14	4.50
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1623	4.47	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.25
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	
	-			ning effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	0	1		1504/1621		3.89		4.24	
9. HOW WO	uiu you	grade the overal	LI CEACI	iling effectiveness	_	U		U	1	U	_	3.00	1304/1021	3.30	3.09	4.00	4.24	3.00
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.74	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.67
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.87	4.57	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1388/1564	3.92	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.50
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.67
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.46	3.87	3.98	4.07	5.00
		Tabaaa																
1 544 46	- 1-b	Laborat crease understar	-	E the meterial	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 67	45 / 221	4.72	4.18	4.16	4 72	1 67
				ground information	1	0	0	0	0	1 1	2		45/ 221 49/ 243	4.72	3.88	4.10	4.73 4.61	4.67
				or lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.67		3.89		4.12	4.57	4.67 4.00
		materials avail structor provide			1	1	0	0	1	0	1		150/ 212	4.19	4.14 3.99	4.40	4.63	4.00
					0	0	0	0	0	1	3		- ,					
5. were r	equireme.	nts for lab repo	orts CI6	early specified	U	U	U	U	U	1	3	4.75	252/ 555	4.73	4.55	4.29	4.41	4./5
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 312	4.57	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.75
		Self F	Paced															
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for		ne students	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.00
				Frequ		- Dd4			_									
				rrequ	lency	DIS	LLIDI	16101	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	8			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Per	 mii r		or Ma	ior	 z	0	Graduat		0	Majo		2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1/6/	14116	Lu I) I 110	י דייין י	ی	U	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	/_	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gor	neral	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non	-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gei	icia.	_				U	onder-9	Luu	-	INOII	a JUI	4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		_{ចា} ា	ectiv	700				0	#### -	Maana t	horo s	re not	- 220110	h
Graa.	U	3.30-4.00	J	P 0		11.1		v CD				•	respons				_	-4
				I 0		Otł	ner					2	TCBPOHB		,c 5191	ıııcaı		
				s 0		OCI						_						
				. 0														

Course-Section: ENME 489C 0101

MACROMECHANICS/COMPOSI

Title

Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 21 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 844 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eauer	cies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		Genera																
		v insights,ski			1	0	2	1	4	9			1471/1649			4.28	4.50	3.60
		or make clear			0	0	2	3	6	8			1566/1648			4.23	4.36	3.24
		estions reflec			1	0	3	1	5	9			1267/1375				4.48	
		ations reflect			0	4	3	1	7	3			1525/1595				4.36	
	_	-		what you learned	1	3	6	1	3	5			1492/1533			4.04	4.14	
		-		to what you learned	1	4	5	3	5	2			1496/1512				4.26	2.44
		system clearl		ined	2	0	4	5	7	1			1596/1623				4.27	
	-	vas class canc			1	0	0	0	1				748/1646				4.71	
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	9	4	1	3.19	1468/1621	3.19	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.19
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture		prepared	3	0	2	0	5	5	6	3 72	1411/1568	3 72	4.36	4.43	4.54	3 72
		or seem inter			2	0	1	1	2	6			1449/1572		4.57	4.70		4.11
				explained clearly	2	0	2	5	6	3			1496/1564		4.01		4.40	
		s contribute t			2	0	2	5	4	6			1473/1559			4.29	4.41	
				your understanding	5	14	1	1	0	0			****/1352			3.98		****
5. Dia au	alovisuai	ceciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	5	14			U	U	U	1.50	/1352		3.07	3.90	4.07	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	***
2. Were a	ll student	s actively en	courage	ed to participate	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	***
3. Did th	e instruct	or encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****
		Labora																
5. Were r	requirement	s for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****
		Semina	~															
E Word	ritoria fo	semina or grading mad		-	19	0	0	0	0	2	Λ	4 00	****/ 288	****	4.27	2 60	3.71	****
J. Wele C	riceria io	or grading mad	e crear		19	U	U	U	U	2	U	4.00	/ 200		4.27	3.00	3.11	
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	****
			-															
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors fo	r all t	the students	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	****
				Frequ	anasz	Diet	rib	ıtior	,									
				riequ	ency	DISC	LID	20101	1									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 S	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9						,,				-	-	- 14) (
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ger	nera:	1			1	0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		001		_			_	-	011401 9	2	_	2.011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E] <i>e</i>	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					6	TCBPOHB	L	c bign			
				1 0		OCI						•						

Course-Section: ENME 489F 0101

Title COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DY

Instructor: MA, RONGHUI

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

84-150

Grad.

3

1

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

2

D

F

0

0

MA, RONGHUI Fall 2008

Page 845 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	eaue	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		
		General															
_	-	ew insights, skills fro		2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.50
		ctor make clear the ex		2	0	0	0	2	2	2		1124/1648		4.06	4.23	4.36	4.00
	_	estions reflect the e	_	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	401/1375		4.22	4.27	4.48	4.67
		ations reflect the ex	_	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	,		4.09	4.20	4.36	4.33
		eadings contribute to		2	2	1	0	0	2			1249/1533		3.60	4.04	4.14	3.50
		signments contribute t	-	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.17			3.98	4.10	4.26	4.17
		g system clearly expla	ined	2	0	0	0	1	2		4.33	720/1623		3.88	4.16	4.27	4.33
		was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	2	2			1544/1646		4.79	4.69	4.71	4.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.67
		Lecture															
1 Were th	ne instri	actor's lectures well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.50
		ctor seem interested i		2	0	0	0	0	2	4		1071/1572		4.57	4.70	4.79	4.67
		terial presented and e	_	2	0	0	0	1	3	_		1028/1564		4.01	4.28	4.40	4.17
		es contribute to what		2	0	0	1	1	2	2		1231/1559	3.83	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.83
		l techniques enhance y		2	4	0	0	2	0	_		1219/1352		3.87	3.98	4.07	3.00
				_	_	-	-	_	-	-		,					
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to	_	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1384		3.56	4.08	4.35	****
		nts actively encourage		7 7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the	id the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	***	3.95	4.30	4.58	****
		Laboratory															
1 Did the	a lah inc	crease understanding o	of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.18	4.16	4.73	****
		ded with adequate back		7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	4.61	****
		materials available f		7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.14	4.40	4.57	****
		structor provide assis		7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	3.99	4.35	4.63	****
		its for lab reports cl		7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****
J. Were re	.quil cilici	ied for fab repores er	edity bpcciffed	,	Ü	Ü	J	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	, 333		1.55	1.27		
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssigned t	copics relevant to the	announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****
		Field Work															
1 Did fie	eld exper	rience contribute to w	hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	4.86	****
	_	understand your eval	_	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****
		ctor available for con		7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
3. nas circ	2 111001 40	Joer avarrabre rer con	.5415451511	•	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	3.00	, 33				1.02	
		Self Paced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	***	3.80	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did stu	ıdy quest	cions make clear the e	expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were yo	our conta	acts with the instruct	or helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	***	****	4.43	4.84	****
_	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students				1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	4.42	3.99	4.22	****
			Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 0	0.00-0.99 0	 A 1					or Ma			0	 Graduat		1	мо		 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	A 1 B 1		кес	quire	eu I	OT Mg	DOLE		U	Gradual	E	1	Majo)T	O
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	2
04_150	2	2.00-2.00 2	D 0		GGI	c.u.	-				•	onaci -g		•	14011		2

Electives

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

I 0 Other 2 ?

Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101

Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE

MOGAVERO, MARC

Instructor:

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 846 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Ouestions	MD	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie	es 4	_	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
Questions		NA				·		Mean	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	меал
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	11	6	3.69	1408/1649	3.69	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.6
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	15	1	3.38	1532/1648	3.38	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.3
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	797/1375	4.27	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.2
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	13	4	3.73	1295/1595	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.36	3.7
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	5	7	6	3.31	1347/1533	3.31	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.3
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	10	4	2	2.69	1485/1512	2.69	3.98	4.10	4.26	2.6
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	9	11	4	0	2.65	1592/1623	2.65	3.88	4.16	4.27	2.6
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.0
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +$	3	0	3	5	7	8	0	2.87	1543/1621	2.87	3.89	4.06	4.24	2.8
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	12	8	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.0
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	7	16	4.46	1273/1572	4.46	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.4
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	3	11	7	3.73	1306/1564	3.73	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.7
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	4	9	6	3.42	1400/1559	3.42	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.4
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	15	4	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.8
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	***
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	* * *
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	***
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	***
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	}
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 17						 Ia ior			 Graduat	- 		Maic		

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	26	Non-major	1
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101

Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION

Instructor: ZHU, LIANG

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 16

ZHU, LIANG Fall 2008

Page 847 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General	-	0	0	•	0	_	0	4 60	F10/1640	4 60	4 1 4	4 00	4 46	4 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60 4.80	510/1649	4.60	4.14	4.28	4.46	4.60
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	1	0	0	0	0	3 1	12 14	4.80	216/1648	4.80	4.06	4.23 4.27	4.34	4.80 4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1 1	6	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	116/1375 144/1595	4.93 4.89	4.22 4.09	4.27	4.44	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	3	o 5	4.69	432/1533	4.44	3.60	4.20	4.33	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	294/1512	4.63	3.98	4.10	4.35	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	4		4.71	. , .	4.71	3.88	4.16	4.29	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	9		1103/1646		4.79	4.69	4.29	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	348/1621		3.89	4.06		4.53
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		U	U	U	U	,	O	4.55	340/1021	4.55	3.05	4.00	1.20	1.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.36	4.43	4.52	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	498/1564	4.64	4.01	4.28	4.41	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	618/1559	4.57	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	234/1352	4.63	3.87	3.98	4.10	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1384		3.56	4.08	4.30	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382		3.97	4.29		5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.56	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.66	5.00
									,					
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	4.27	3.68	3.87	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	7		****/ 48	***	2.75 ****	4.00	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.09	4.47	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 312		4.36	3.68	3.83	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	Τ	U	U	U	Т	1	4.50	/ 312		4.30	3.00	3.03	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	14/ 110	4.60	4.42	3.99	3.92	4.60
_														

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-	_		

? 2

Course-Section: ENME 645 0101

Title APPL COMP THERMO/FLUID

Instructor: MA, RONGHUI

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 848 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.14	4.28	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.14	4.23	4.34	5.00
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.22	4.27		4.75
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	0		4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.09	4.20	4.35	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1		4.25	624/1533	4.25	3.60	4.04	4.28	4.25
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	194/1512	4.75	3.98	4.10	4.35	4.75
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.88	4.16	4.29	5.00
		was class canc		ined	0	0	0	0	0	3			1398/1646	4.25	4.79	4.69		4.25
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1			234/1621			4.06	4.20	
J. 110W WO	aia you gi	iade the overa	II ccac	ning circectveness	_	O	U	Ü	O	_	2	1.07	231/1021	1.07	3.05	1.00	1.20	1.07
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.36	4.43	4.52	5.00
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.83	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.41	5.00
		s contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.95	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	3.87	3.98	4.10	4.33
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dican			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.56	4.08	4.30	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.97	4.29	4.52	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.56	5.00
		chniques succe		a open arbeabbion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.03	3.95	4.03	4.00
1	poorar oo	Jimii queb buece	22242		J	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	131, 710	1.00	1.05	3.75	1.05	1.00
		Labora	_															
				f the material	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 221	5.00		4.16	4.27	5.00
				ground information	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 243	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.61	5.00
	_			or lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.14	4.40	4.73	5.00
		tructor provid			2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 209	5.00	3.99	4.35	4.80	5.00
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.66	5.00
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.36	3.68	3.83	4.00
				D		D	1											
				Frequ	ency	DIST	crib	utioi	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Rec	mir	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						,	-	-	or adda.	-	_			5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	1
84-150												-	9-				,	=
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0	_		3			
				? 0		001101												

Course-Section: ENME 664 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title DYNAMICS Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

Page 849 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Ctudant	('011760	Evaluation	Ougetion	סמוכמו

Frequencies

Instructor

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	OMRC.	телет	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		Genera w insights,ski	_		2	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	723/1649	1 11	1 11	4 20	1 10	4.44
					2	0	0	1	_	4			-, -	4.44		4.28	4.46	
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	2	_	11	4.39	729/1648	4.39	4.06	4.23	4.34	4.39
					2	0	•	-	2	1	15	4.72		4.72		4.27	4.44	4.72
		ations reflect			2	4	0	0	2	3		4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.09	4.20	4.35	4.50
				what you learned	3	5	0	0	4	1	7		624/1533	4.25	3.60	4.04	4.28	4.25
				o what you learned	3	4	0	1	2	3		4.23		4.23	3.98	4.10	4.35	4.23
		g system clearl		ined	3	0	0	2	2	2		4.29	768/1623	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.29	4.29
	-	was class canc			4	0	0	1	0	9			1398/1646	4.25		4.69		4.25
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	754/1621	4.20	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	779/1568	4.56	4.36	4.43	4.52	4.56
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	2			665/1572			4.70	4.83	
				explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	4		4.44			4.01			4.44
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	0	4			390/1559	4.75		4.29		4.75
				our understanding	4	10	0	1	0	1	4	4.33			3.87		4.10	
5. Did au	.aiovisuai	. teciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	4	10	U	1	U	Τ	4	4.33	45//1352	4.33	3.07	3.90	4.10	4.33
		Discus																
				what you learned	15 15	0	1	0	0	2		3.80	,	3.80	3.56	4.08	4.30	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	716/1382	4.40	3.97	4.29	4.52	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1368	4.60	3.95	4.30	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful					15	1	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.03	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	equiremen		-	early specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.66	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad		,	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	34/ 288	4.63	4.27	3.68	3.87	4.63
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	15	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	36/ 312	4.40	4.36	3.68	3.83	4.40
		Self	Daged															
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors fo		he students	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	***	4.42	3.99	3.92	****
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	awnod	Cum CDA		Ermostod Crodos				Do					т.				Majara	
		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	, . – – –			Ту]	 ñe			Majors 	, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 11		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	8	Majo	or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2										_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L2	Non-	-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	2	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1					ŗh
				-		01.3	la a r ·					0	respons	es co l	be sign	ıııcar	IL	
				I 0		Otl	her					8						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENME 812T 0101

Title ADV KINEMATICS & MECH

Instructor: SU, HAIJUN

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 850 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	quencies 2 3		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.14	4.28	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	1		1313/1648	3.80	4.06	4.23	4.34	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2		1087/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.44	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0 2	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.09	4.20	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4 5	3	4.13	733/1533 835/1512	4.13	3.60 3.98	4.04	4.28 4.35	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5 5	2		1241/1623	4.10 3.80	3.88	4.10 4.16	4.35	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.78	4.79	4.16	4.29	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	835/1621		3.89	4.06	4.20	4.13
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3	5	1.13	033/1021	1.13	3.03	1.00	1.20	1.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1358/1568	3.88	4.36	4.43	4.52	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1121/1572	4.63	4.57	4.70	4.83	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	2	3		1297/1564		4.01	4.28	4.41	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2		4.25	966/1559		3.95		4.41	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	836/1352	3.88	3.87	3.98	4.10	3.88
Plantania														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	2 67	1011/1204	2 67	2 56	4 00	4 20	2 67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1011/1384 946/1382	3.67 4.00	3.56 3.97	4.08 4.29	4.30 4.52	3.67 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	0		1229/1368	3.33	3.95	4.29	4.54	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	1	1	0		901/ 948			3.95		2.67
i. Wele special teemingues successial	,	Ü	-	Ü	_	_	Ü	2.07	301/ 310	2.07	1.05	3.75	1.05	2.07
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	3.99	4.35	4.80	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.66	5.00
Seminar	_	0	•	•	0	-	0	4 00	****	ale ale ale ale	ate ate ate ate	4 = 4	4 60	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 88	***	***	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0 1	0	1	0		****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	****	4.47 4.43	4.50 4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.87	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	O	_	O	O	O	_	Ü	1.00	, 200		1.27	3.00	3.07	
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.83	****
-														
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	3.92	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected G	rades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		General	5	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0							
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2 F 0 Electives		Electives	2	#### - Means	are not enough	1		
				P 0				responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I 0		Other	0	-	_		
				2 1							