Title Intro Engr Design W/ C

Instructor: Spence, Anne M

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 22

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 728 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	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	1	2	1	7	11		1010/1509	3.86	3.96	4.31	4.34	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	-7	11	4.32	796/1509	3.85	3.98	4.26	4.32	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	728/1287	4.07	3.98	4.30	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	7	13	4.48	503/1459	3.88	3.94	4.22	4.30	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	5	4	7		1122/1406	3.44	3.62	4.09	4.09	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	8	7	3.86	978/1384	3.47	3.87	4.11	4.09	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	597/1489	3.92	3.81	4.17	4.19	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	11		1098/1506	4.61	4.70	4.67	4.61	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	325/1463	3.60	3.78	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	559/1438	3.90	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	15		1049/1421	3.66	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	508/1411	3.77	3.95	4.31	4.37	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	596/1405	3.60	3.90	4.32	4.39	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	83/1236	4.29	3.78	4.00	4.11	4.86
5. Dia addiovibuai eccimiques cimanee your anacisednamy	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_		1.00	03/1230	1.25	3.70	1.00		1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	582/1260	3.66	3.57	4.14	4.19	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	665/1255	3.58	3.75	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	792/1258	3.71	3.76	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	306/ 873	3.66	3.68	4.03	4.04	4.30
- 1														
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1.0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2 67	****/ 184	****	1 21	1 10	4 54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	2	1		, -	****	4.34	4.16 $4.22$	4.54	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19 19	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 198 ****/ 184	****	3.89 4.40	4.48	4.51 4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	0	2	0		****/ 177	****	3.87	4.48	4.62 4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	1	∠ 1	0		****/ 165	****	3.87	4.18	4.56	****
5. were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	U	U	Т	Т	Т	U	3.00	~~~/ 105		3.//	4.18	4.50	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
		-	-	-	-	-	_		, 23					
Frequ	encv	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	14	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	3	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Title Intro Engr Design W/ C

Instructor: Spence, Anne M

Enrollment:

17 Questionnaires: 11

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 729 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	^	0	1	1	^	2	4	2 72	1214/1500	2 06	2 06	4 21	4 24	2 72
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1 0	Τ	∠ 5	3	4		1314/1509	3.86	3.96	4.31	4.34	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	1	2	-				1412/1509	3.85	3.98	4.26	4.32	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	_	0	0	5	5		832/1287	4.07	3.98	4.30	4.35	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	3	3		1271/1459	3.88	3.94	4.22	4.30	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	3		1303/1406	3.44	3.62	4.09	4.09	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	0	2	1		1364/1384	3.47	3.87	4.11	4.09	2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	2	3		1303/1489	3.92	3.81	4.17	4.19	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	8		965/1506	4.61	4.70	4.67	4.61	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	1329/1463	3.60	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	0	3	3 63	1353/1438	3.90	4.27	4.46	4.48	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	2	2		1394/1421	3.66	4.45	4.73	4.76	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	2	2		1320/1411	3.77	3.95	4.31	4.37	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	1	2		1321/1405	3.60	3.90	4.32	4.39	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	1	3		853/1236		3.78	4.00	4.11	
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	J	U	U		J	_	5	3.73	033/1230	4.27	3.70	1.00	T.11	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	982/1260	3.66	3.57	4.14	4.19	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1167/1255	3.58	3.75	4.33	4.37	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1041/1258	3.71	3.76	4.38	4.44	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	650/ 873	3.66	3.68	4.03	4.04	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	4.34	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.40	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	3.87	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	3.77	4.18	4.56	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	 7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Title Intro Engr Design W/ C

Instructor: Spence, Anne M

Enrollment:

8 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 730 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Instructor Mean Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
<u> </u>													
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71 1317/1509	3.86	3.96	4.31	4.34	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86 1196/1509	3.85	3.98	4.26	4.32	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71 1104/1287	4.07	3.98	4.30	4.35	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57 1283/1459	3.88	3.94	4.22	4.30	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50 1178/1406	3.44	3.62	4.09	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	3.83 993/1384	3.47	3.87	4.11	4.09	3.83
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86 1141/1489		3.81	4.17	4.19	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71 896/1506		4.70	4.67	4.61	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00 1392/1463	3.60	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.00
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40 1381/1438	3.90	4.27	4.46	4.48	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80 1416/1421	3.66	4.45	4.73	4.76	2.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40 1309/1411	3.77	3.95	4.31	4.37	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00 1348/1405	3.60	3.90	4.32	4.39	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25 489/1236	4.29	3.78	4.00	4.11	4.25
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00 1162/1260	3.66	3.57	4.14	4.19	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00 1202/1255		3.75	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00 1222/1258		3.76	4.38	4.44	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00 801/ 873		3.68	4.03	4.04	3.00
- 1													
Laboratory	_	0	•	•	1	0	•	2 00 ++++ / 10		4 2 4	4 16	4 5 4	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/ 184	="	4.34	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/ 198		3.89	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1 1	0	U	3.00 ****/ 184 3.00 ****/ 175		4.40	4.48	4.62 4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6 6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/ 165		3.87	4.36	4.65	****
5. were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	ь	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00 " " " / 10:	) ^ ^ ^	3.77	4.18	4.50	

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

Irvine,David E

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

University of Maryland

Mechanics Of Materials Baltimore County

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 70

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 731 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

										_				
Questions	MD	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie 3	es 4	5	Mean	tructor		_	UMBC		Sect Mean
Questions		NA.				<del></del>		Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean .
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	6	17	45	4.54	563/1509	4.43	3.96	4.31	4.34	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	14	20	33	4.22	901/1509	4.24	3.98	4.26	4.32	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	16	49	4.65	370/1287	4.49	3.98	4.30	4.35	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	1	3	19	20	4.35	676/1459	4.32	3.94	4.22	4.30	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	21	0	1	11	14	22	4.19	665/1406	4.09	3.62	4.09	4.09	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	4	15	28	4.51	341/1384	4.41	3.87	4.11	4.09	4.51
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	9	18	42	4.48	499/1489		3.81	4.17	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	23	45	4.66	941/1506			4.67	4.61	4.66
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	1	13	28	15	3.95	931/1463	3.84	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	5	9	26	29	4.14	1147/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	10	58		742/1421		4.45	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	4	19	25	16	3.62	1249/1411	3.84	3.95	4.31	4.37	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	10	12	18	23	3.65	1227/1405	3.76	3.90	4.32	4.39	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	23	1	5	19	7	12	3.55	964/1236	3.91	3.78	4.00	4.11	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1255	****	3.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/1258	****	3.76	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	67	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 873		3.68	4.03	4.04	****
af									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.34	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.51	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.40	4.48	4.62	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	3.87	4.36	4.65	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	3.77	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	69	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	***
Calf Darad														
Self Paced  1. Did gelf-paged gygtem gentribute to what you learned	60	0	0	^	0	^	1	E 00	****/ 49	****	****	1 26	1 22	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69 69	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49 ****/ 41	****	****	4.26 4.14	4.33	****
<ol> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> </ol>	69	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41		****	4.14	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tytoring by prostors helpful	69	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 27		****	4.31	4.00	****

69 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 37 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.05 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

Title Mechanics Of Materials

Instructor: Irvine, David E

Enrollment: 78
Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 731 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	63	Graduate	0	Major	62
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	16	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	70	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 220 2 University of Maryland Title Mechanics Of Materials Baltimore County

Tshibangu,Wa-Mu

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 732

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 15
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

? 0

							Fr	equei	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	Ο	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	800/1509	4.43	3.96	4.31	4.34	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	849/1509		3.98	4.26	4.32	4.27
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	708/1287		3.98	4.30	4.35	4.33
	_	uations reflect		1 5	0	5	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	715/1459		3.94	4.22	4.30	4.30
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	813/1406	4.09	3.62	4.09	4.09	4.00
	-	-		to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	570/1384	4.41	3.87	4.11	4.09	4.31
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	885/1489	4.31	3.81	4.17	4.19	4.13
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1166/1506	4.53	4.70	4.67	4.61	4.40
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1125/1463	3.84	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.73
1 Wowo +1	ho inata	Lectur uctor's lecture	_	nanarad	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	1 27	1063/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.48	4.27
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	4	10		1084/1421		4.45	4.73	4.46	4.60
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	4	6		1004/1421	3.84	3.95	4.73	4.37	4.07
		es contribute t		1	0	0	0	1	5	4	5		1150/1405		3.90	4.32	4.39	3.87
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	481/1236		3.78	4.00	4.11	4.27
3. 21a aa		1 0001111144400 011	1101100 ]	our undersounding	Ü	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	•	Ü	1.27	101, 1230	3.71	3.70	1.00		
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.19	****
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/1255		3.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1258	****	3.76	4.38	4.44	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
								_					_				,	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 10														
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					0						

Course-Section: ENME 301 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Struct/Prop:Engr Mater

Instructor: Topoleski,L D

Enrollment: 56 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 733

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		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															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	1	2	10	10	4.26	872/1509	4.26	3.96	4.31	4.32	4.26
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	3	6	5	9	3.87	1189/1509	3.87	3.98	4.26	4.25	3.87
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	1	1	8	8	5	3.65	1121/1287	3.65	3.98	4.30	4.33	3.65
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	9	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	931/1459	4.07	3.94	4.22	4.26	4.07
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	2	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	635/1406	4.21	3.62	4.09	4.12	4.21
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	7	2	1	0	3	8	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	4	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	728/1489	4.29	3.81	4.17	4.14	4.29
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	918/1463	3.95	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.95
1 Were +1	he instri	Lectur	nrenared	6	0	1	1	2	4	11	4 21	1102/1438	4.21	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.21	
	e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	4	1	14		1146/1421		4.45	4.73	4.73	4.53
					6 6	0	1	1	5	4	8		1149/1411		3.95	4.31	4.29	3.89
		es contribute t			6	0	0	1	5	4	9		1001/1405		3.90	4.32	4.32	4.11
				our understanding	7	8	3	0	2	2	3		1088/1236		3.78	4.00	4.07	3.20
		-	-	3														
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.22	****
				d to participate	23	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/1255		3.75	4.33	4.37	****
				d open discussion	23	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/1258		3.76	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		22	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	****	3.68	4.03	4.08	****
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis	trib	utio	n									
	,							_					_					
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ន 			Ту	pe 			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						
				0 0														

Course-Section: ENME 301H 2 University of Maryland Page 734 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Honors Struct/Prop:Eng

Instructor: Topoleski,L D

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 3

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	3.96	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1509	4.67	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	708/1287	4.33	3.98	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.94	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.62	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	531/1384	4.33	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.67	3.81	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.50	3.78	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	Ο	0	Ο	Ο	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.27	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1421		4.45	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1411	5.00	3.95	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	3.90	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0		1131/1236	3.00	3.78	4.00	4.07	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	415/1260	4.50	3.57	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1255		3.75	4.14		5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1258		3.76	4.38	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	т	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	1/1250	5.00	3.10	1.30	7.72	3.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDA Evnested Grades				Pos	acone				Тъл	ne.			Majorg	

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

Title Topics In Engineer Mat

Instructor: Vonkerczek, Chri

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 4

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 735 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	-	ncies				ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1114/1509	3.91	3.96	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1259/1509	4.01	3.98	4.26	4.25	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1118/1287	4.05	3.98	4.30	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1367/1459	4.03	3.94	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1373/1406	4.25	3.62	4.09	4.12	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1107/1384	4.02	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1303/1489	3.86	3.81	4.17	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1070/1506	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1338/1463	3.59	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.13	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1345/1421	4.23	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1051/1411	3.76	3.95	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1265/1405	3.91	3.90	4.32	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	984/1236	4.00	3.78	4.00	4.07	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	746/1260	3.90	3.57	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1127/1255	3.59	3.75	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1143/1258	3.59	3.76	4.38	4.42	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	705/ 873	4.25	3.68	4.03	4.08	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 184	4.25	4.34	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	3.89	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/ 184	4.75	4.40	4.48	4.52	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	163/ 177	4.25	3.87	4.36	4.30	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	141/ 165	3.75	3.77	4.18	4.11	3.50

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

Title Topics In Engineer Mat

Instructor: Vonkerczek, Chri

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 25

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 736 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2 2 3 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 11 3 13 0 1	1 0 0 0 1 0 0	0 2 0 0 0 0 0	8 6 2 2 4 1 3 0 8	4 6 6 5 3 4 11 14	10 9 14 5 12 5 9 8	3.96 4.55 4.25 4.25 4.40 4.26 4.36	1164/1509 1125/1509 481/1287 770/1459 587/1406 440/1384 749/1489 1188/1506 1273/1463	4.01 4.05 4.03 4.25 4.02 3.86 4.63	3.96 3.98 3.98 3.94 3.62 3.87 3.81 4.70 3.78	4.31 4.26 4.30 4.22 4.09 4.11 4.17 4.67 4.09	4.32 4.25 4.33 4.26 4.12 4.15 4.14 4.67 4.08	3.96 3.96 4.55 4.25 4.25 4.40 4.26 4.36 3.44
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5 4 4 4 5	0 0 0 0 9	0 0 0 2 1	0 0 6 0	4 3 6 7 4	8 3 4 3 1	8 15 5 9 5	4.20 4.57 3.38 3.81	1116/1438 1107/1421 1312/1411 1177/1405 819/1236	4.13 4.23 3.76 3.91	4.27 4.45 3.95 3.90 3.78	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32 4.00	4.43 4.73 4.29 4.32 4.07	4.20 4.57 3.38 3.81 3.82
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	12 12 12 13	0 0 0 8	1 4 4 0	2 2 2 1	2 3 3 0	4 0 0 0	4 4 4 3	2.85 2.85	1006/1260 1227/1255 1241/1258 ****/ 873	3.59 3.59	3.57 3.75 3.76 3.68	4.14 4.33 4.38 4.03	4.22 4.37 4.42 4.08	3.62 2.85 2.85 ***
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21 21 21 22 22	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 1 1 1	3 2 2 2 1	1 1 1 0 0	4.00 4.00 3.67	****/ 184 ****/ 198 ****/ 184 ****/ 177 ****/ 165	4.00 4.75 4.25	4.34 3.89 4.40 3.87 3.77	4.16 4.22 4.48 4.36 4.18	4.07 4.17 4.52 4.30 4.11	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.86	****
Frequence Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	ıency	Dis	trib		n ason:	S			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 15 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 7 2.00-2.99 1 C 2			quire	ed fo				0	Graduat Under-g	-  e	0 25	Majo		20
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 7 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ecti her	ves				0	#### - 1 respons				_	h

Title Topics In Engineer Mat

Instructor: Vonkerczek, Chri

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 737 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1473/1509	3.91	3.96	4.31	4.32	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1306/1509	4.01	3.98	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1287	4.05	3.98	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	454/1459	4.03	3.94	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.25	3.62	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.02	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1450/1489	3.86	3.81	4.17	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1392/1463	3.59	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1343/1438	4.13	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1404/1421	4.23	4.45	4.73	4.73	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1361/1411	3.76	3.95	4.31	4.29	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1220/1405	3.91	3.90	4.32	4.32	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	904/1236	4.00	3.78	4.00	4.07	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1162/1260	3.90	3.57	4.14	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.59	3.75	4.33	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1222/1258	3.59	3.76	4.38	4.42	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.25	4.34	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	3.89	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	4.75	4.40	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	4.25	3.87	4.36	4.30	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	103/ 165	3.75	3.77	4.18	4.11	4.00

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

Title Topics In Engineer Mat

Instructor: Vonkerczek, Chri

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 5

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 738 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	410/1509	3.91	3.96	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1509	4.01	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1287	4.05	3.98	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1459	4.03	3.94	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.25	3.62	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	4.02	3.87	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	3.86	3.81	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	3.59	3.78	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.13	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.13	4.45	4.73	4.43	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	416/1411	3.76	3.95	4.73	4.73	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	3.70	3.90	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	U	2	5.00	1/1236	4.00	3.78	4.00	4.07	5.00
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4		U	U	U	U	4	3.00	1/1230	4.00	3.70	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	3.90	3.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	3.59	3.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	3.59	3.76	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	4.25	3.68	4.03	4.08	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	Λ	0	Λ	1	E 00	****/ 184	4.25	4.34	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 198	4.25	3.89	4.10	4.07	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184	4.75	4.40	4.48	4.17	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	Τ.	1		****/ 177	4.75	3.87	4.46	4.30	***
1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ I//	4.45	3.07	1.30	1.30	

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 739

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 39 Questionnaires: 31 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 304 1

Machine Design

Farquhar, Anthon

Title

Instructor:

			NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean		
		Genera:	 L															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skii	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	2	4	13	10	3.97	1154/1509	3.97	3.96	4.31	4.32	3.97
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	2	14	7	7	3.63	1318/1509	3.63	3.98	4.26	4.25	3.63
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	3	0	1	4	11	4	8	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	3.98	4.30	4.33	3.50
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	3	0	2	12	4	9	3.74	1197/1459	3.74	3.94	4.22	4.26	3.74
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	9	6	3	4	5	3	2.81	1369/1406	2.81	3.62	4.09	4.12	2.81
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	6	1	2	10	8	3	3.42	1230/1384	3.42	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.42
		system clearly		ined	1	0	4	3	11	7			1382/1489		3.81	4.17	4.14	3.20
	-	was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	1			233/1506		4.70	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	1	3	7	10	3	3.46	1268/1463	3.46	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.46
		Lecture	3															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	2	0	1	3	3	10	12	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	4	3	22	4.62	1060/1421	4.62	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.62
3. Was led	cture mate	xplained clearly	2	0	1	4	10	8	6	3.48	1283/1411	3.48	3.95	4.31	4.29	3.48		
	as lecture material presented and explained clea id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					0	1	2	8	12	6	3.69	1213/1405	3.69	3.90	4.32	4.32	3.69
5. Did aud	diovisual	our understanding	2	17	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1078/1236	3.25	3.78	4.00	4.07	3.25		
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to	what you learned	27	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.22	****
				d to participate	27	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1255	****	3.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage i	fair an	d open discussion	27	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1258	****	3.76	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		26	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.68	4.03	4.08	***
		Laborat	corv															
2. Were yo	ou provid		_	ground information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	***	3.89	4.22	4.17	***
		Field V	Mork															
1 Did fie	eld exper			hat you learned	29	0	1	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
				uation criteria	29	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 48		****	4.41	4.34	****
_	_	tor available			29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47		****	4.51	4.62	****
		could you disc			29	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47		****	4.18	4.47	****
	_	-	-	ield activities	29	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	***
		Self I	Daged															
1. Did sel	lf-paced :			what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
				Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	utio	n									
		11040	.01107	210	0110													
Credits Ea	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe 			Majors	S 		
00-27								ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	5	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 14				_					_					
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	8
84-150												•						,
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - respons				_	gh
				I O		O+1	ner					0	T CBPOIIS		c bigi	LLLCan		
				? 2		0.01						-						

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 31

Course-Section	: ENME 320 2	University of Maryland	Page 740
Title	Fluid Mechanics	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Carmi,Shlomo	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions	3		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	-															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls from	this course	0	0	2	2	5	11	11	3.87	1236/1509	3.53	3.96	4.31	4.32	3.87
		ctor make clear	_	_	0	0	1	5	9	10	6	3.48	1378/1509	3.48	3.98	4.26	4.25	3.48
		uestions reflect			0	0	1	1	5	11	13	4.10	,	3.40	3.98	4.30	4.33	4.10
		uations reflect			0	21	1	2	3	2	2		1396/1459	3.24	3.94	4.22	4.26	3.20
	_	-		what you learned	0	7	1	0	7	3	13	4.13	720/1406		3.62	4.09	4.12	4.13
				what you learned		13	1	0	2		7		742/1384		3.87	4.11	4.15	4.11
		g system clearly	-	ned	0	0	0	4	2		18	4.26	760/1489	4.20	3.81	4.17	4.14	4.26
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	3	28		583/1506		4.70	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	.l teach	ning effectiveness	4	1	2	0	10	9	5	3.58	1217/1463	3.11	3.78	4.09	4.08	3.58
		Lecture			•		_	_						4 0 -				
1. Were t			0	0	0	0	6	11			1071/1438			4.46	4.43	4.26		
		the subject	1	0	0	0	2	9			1115/1421	4.11	4.45	4.73	4.73	4.57		
				xplained clearly	1		3		9	7			1346/1411			4.31	4.29	3.17
		es contribute to			1	0 13	3 3	4	6 7	10			1276/1405	3.46		4.32	4.32	3.47
5. Did at	lalovisua.	ı tecnniques enr	lance yo	our understanding	1	13	3	2	/	3	2	2.94	1150/1236	3.09	3.78	4.00	4.07	2.94
		Discuss																
1 Did al	اممم کامم			what you learned	24	0	2	0	4	0	0	2 1 4	****/1260	****	2 57	4.14	4.22	****
				l to participate	24	0	5 5	1	0	0	1		****/1255		3.75	4.14	4.22	****
				d open discussion	24	0	2	1	2	0	2		****/1258		3.76	4.38	4.42	****
		echniques succes		open discussion	24	6	0	1	0	0	٥		****/ 873					****
T. WEIE S	special co	eciniiques succes	berur		21	U	U		U	U	U	2.00	/ 0/3		3.00	1.05	1.00	
				Freq	uency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Re	quire	ed f	or M	 aior	s 2	6	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	r •	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 12			_									3		
56-83							neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 3	0	Non-	major	9
84-150													5				<b>J</b> -	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouq	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENME 320 3 University of Maryland Fluid Mechanics

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Instructor: Bennett, Dawn

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 23

Page 741 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 46 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.31 5.00 \*\*\*\*

0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 37 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.05 5.00 \*\*\*\*

0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.27 5.00 \*\*\*\*

			Fre	equei	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	2	0	4	2	5	6	4	3 19	1456/1509	3.53	3.96	4.31	4.32	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	7	4	6		1381/1509		3.98	4.26	4.25	3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	8	2	6	1		1281/1287		3.98	4.30	4.33	2.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	2	1	4	5	2		1382/1459		3.94	4.22	4.26	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	1	6	3	3		1279/1406		3.62	4.09	4.12	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	1	0	5	2	3		1173/1384		3.87	4.11	4.15	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	9	8		875/1489		3.81	4.17	4.14	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	18		682/1506		4.70	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	4	1	5	4	0		1436/1463		3.78	4.09	4.08	2.64
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		J	-	_	3	-	Ü	2.01	1130/1103	3.11	3.70	1.05	1.00	2.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	8	5	6	3.75	1315/1438	4.00	4.27	4.46	4.43	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	2	3	7	6	3.65	1387/1421	4.11	4.45	4.73	4.73	3.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	6	3	2	7	3.30	1325/1411	3.23	3.95	4.31	4.29	3.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	9	3	5	3.45	1279/1405	3.46	3.90	4.32	4.32	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	3	8	1	4	3.24	1082/1236	3.09	3.78	4.00	4.07	3.24
Discussion	1.0	0	-	0	1	0	0	0 00	**** / 1 0 6 0	als als als als	2 5 5	4 1 4	4 00	ale ale ale ale
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	2	1	0	0		****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	3	0	0	0	1		****/1255	****	3.75	4.33	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	2	0	1		****/1258	****	3.76	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	****	3.68	4.03	4.08	***
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.17	****
									,					
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.67	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.63	****
Field Work														
	2.2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 48	++++	++++	4 20	1 (1	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	-	•	1	1 0	•	0		,	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0			0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47			4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
The state of the s		_	-	_		-	_							

## 22 0 1 Frequency Distribution

22 0 1

0 1

0 0 0

0

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 0

Course-Section: ENME 321 1 University of Maryland Page 742
Title Transfer Processes Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Zhu, Liang

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 17

Fall 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei	ncies	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	711/1509	4.41	3.96	4.31	4.32	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	683/1509	4.41	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	381/1287	4.65	3.98	4.30	4.33	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	520/1459	4.47	3.94	4.22	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	746/1406	4.09	3.62	4.09	4.12	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	773/1384	4.07	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	499/1489	4.47	3.81	4.17	4.14	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	973/1506	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	325/1463	4.50	3.78	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	305/1438	4.85	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.45	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	- 8	4.67	416/1411	4.67	3.95	4.31	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	634/1405	4.50	3.90	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	354/1236	4.40	3.78	4.00	4.07	4.40

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Solid Mech And Mat Lab

Title

Instructor: Zupan,Marcus

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 23

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 743 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	528/1509			4.31		4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	471/1509	4.57	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	8	8	3.96	972/1287		3.98		4.33	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	291/1459			4.22	4.26	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	1	3	2	2	4		1231/1406		3.62	4.09	4.12	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	3	15	4.32	557/1384		3.87		4.15	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	707/1489	4.30		4.17	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506		4.70	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	196/1463	4.68	3.78	4.09	4.08	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	334/1438	4.83	4.27	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.45	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	544/1411	4.57	3.95	4.31	4.29	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	671/1405	4.48	3.90	4.32	4.32	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	1	8	10	4.24	504/1236			4.00	4.07	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.22	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/1255	****	3.75	4.33	4.37	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1258	****	3.76	4.38	4.42	***
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.68	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	37/ 184	4.67	4.34	4.16	4.07	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	75/ 198	4.42	3.89	4.22	4.17	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	77/ 184		4.40	4.48	4.52	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	65/ 177			4.36	4.30	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	81/ 165		3.77		4.11	
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearly specified	11	U	U		2	2	,	4.23	01/ 103	4.23	3.77	4.10	4.11	1.23
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****
1 succession from the search		-	ŭ	Ü	-	Ü	J	2.00	, 30			,	3.00	
Emagn		Dia	- wib		_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gra	ades Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	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	gnificant	

I 0 Other 0 ? 1

Title Automatic Controls Anjanappa, Munis

Instructor: Enrollment: 50 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 744 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Tnat	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Levrel	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	0	•	•	2	1.0	- 4	•	2 62	1250/1500	2 62	2 06	4 21	4 20	2 62
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	12	14	9 5		1359/1509		3.96	4.31	4.39	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	10 10	10 13	15 9	5		1410/1509		3.98	4.26	4.26	3.38 3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0 11	3	7	8	5	6		1234/1287 1406/1459		3.98 3.94	4.30 4.22	4.38	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	15	2	2	3	10	5		1122/1406		3.62	4.22	4.11	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	4	4	9	6	3		1322/1384		3.87	4.11	4.23	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	7	10	8	10		1323/1489		3.81	4.17	4.18	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	15	22		1030/1506		4.70	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	10	$^{1}$	8	1		1402/1463			4.09	4.18	2.94
7. now would you grade the overall teaching circultumess	O	O	_	10		O	_	2.71	1102/1105	2.71	3.70	1.00	1.10	2.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	4	5	12	16	4.08	1179/1438	4.08	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	6	16	15	4.18	1314/1421	4.18	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.18
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	6	10	11	5	3.08	1356/1411	3.08	3.95	4.31	4.35	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	4	10	15	3	3.13	1337/1405	3.13	3.90	4.32	4.34	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	24	3	1	5	0	1	2.50	1197/1236	2.50	3.78	4.00	4.03	2.50
Diamonian														
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	1	1	0	Λ	2 00	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/1255		3.75	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/1258		3.76	4.38	4.51	****
5. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	31	U	U			U		3.33	/1250		3.70	1.30	1.31	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	1	0	0	Λ	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	1	0	n		****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	33	U	U	U	Τ.	U	U	3.00	/ 93			4.00	1.52	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	1	0	0	0	n		****/ 37		****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 30		****	4.27	4.33	****
									,					
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	40	Non-major	12
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	

I 0 Other 0 ? 1

Course-Section: ENME 409 1 University of Maryland Page 745 Title Mech: Deformable Solid Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Farrokh,Babak

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	470/1509	4.62	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	167/1509	4.85	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	101/1287	4.92	3.98	4.30	4.38	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1459	4.86	3.94	4.22	4.32	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	623/1406	4.22	3.62	4.09	4.11	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	107/1384	4.80	3.87	4.11	4.23	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	127/1489	4.85	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	144/1463	4.77	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.27	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	429/1421	4.92	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	482/1411	4.62	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	239/1405	4.85	3.90	4.32	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	489/1236	4.25	3.78	4.00	4.03	4.25
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	3.75	4.33	4.46	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									

Credits Ea	arned						Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 425 1 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Internal Combus Engine

Instructor: Vonkerczek,Chri

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 16

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 746

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	_															
		w insights,ski			2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	698/1509		3.96	4.31		4.43
		tor make clear			2	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14			3.98	4.26	4.26	4.14
		estions reflec			2	0	0	0	3	3	8		688/1287		3.98	4.30	4.38	4.36
		ations reflect			3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	520/1459		3.94	4.22	4.32	4.46
	_	-		nat you learned	4	3	2	0		2	4		1105/1406			4.09	4.11	3.67
		_		what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	4	5		762/1384		3.87	4.11	4.23	4.08
		system clearly		ned	3	0	0	0	3	4			781/1489		3.81	4.17	4.18	4.23
	-	was class cance			4	0	0	0	1	6			1205/1506		4.70	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How wou	How would you grade the overall teaching effective				2	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	750/1463	4.14	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.14
		Lecture	_															
1 Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	_	repared	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4 33	1001/1438	4.33	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.33
		tor seem inter			4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	881/1421		4.45	4.73	4.76	4.75
				plained clearly	5	0		0	3	4			1005/1411			4.31	4.35	4.09
					4	0	0	0	2	3			745/1405		3.90	4.32		4.42
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					4	0	1	0	3			580/1236			4.00		4.14
		-	-	3														
		Discus																
				nat you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0			****/1260			4.14	4.25	****
				to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0			****/1255		3.75	4.33	4.46	****
		_		open discussion	15	0	0	0					****/1258		3.76	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.68	4.03	4.26	****
		Labora	torv															
2. Were yo	u provid			round information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.37	****
_	_	_																
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ıtior	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	·	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Per	 mir		or Ma	iore		6	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В 6		1000	1411		J_ 110		_	~	Gradat	_	•	1100	-	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-q	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								-			-		5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				6	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	rh
	-		-	P 0									respons					•
				I O		Oth	ıer					0			5			
				? 0														

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 432L 2 University of Maryland Page 747 Title Fluids/Energy Lab MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Eggleton,Charle Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	M

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

19

	Frequencies					Instru	ctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90 12	14/1509	3.56	3.96	4.31	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00 10	86/1509	3.49	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	3	3	0	3.50 11	68/1287	3.25	3.98	4.30	4.38	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56 12	92/1459	3.32	3.94	4.22	4.32	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	2	2	0	3.50 11	78/1406	3.08	3.62	4.09	4.11	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30 5	70/1384	3.62	3.87	4.11	4.23	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20 13	82/1489	3.18	3.81	4.17	4.18	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.96	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	5	0	3.50 12	41/1463	3.23	3.78	4.09	4.18	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44 8	78/1438	4.07	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11 13	28/1421	3.59	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22 9	11/1411	3.66	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44 12	82/1405	2.69	3.90	4.32	4.34	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	0	2	3.14 11	04/1236	3.05	3.78	4.00	4.03	3.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 184	3.91	4.34	4.16	4.62	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	1	0	2		82/ 198		3.89	4.22	4.37	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	0	3		61/ 184	3.69	4.40	4.48	4.66	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	0	2	0		69/ 177	2.35	3.87	4.36	4.47	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	2	0		36/ 165	2.68	3.77	4.18	4.29	3.67

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	1						

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 13

20

2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

Course-Section: ENME 432L 3 University of Maryland Page 748 Title MAR 22, 2010 Fluids/Energy Lab Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Eggleton, Charle

			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	Λ	3	5	4	1	3 23	1450/1509	3.56	3.96	4.31	4.39	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	4	0		1488/1509	3.49	3.98	4.26	4.26	2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	1	0	1	2	0		1247/1287	3.25	3.98	4.30	4.38	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	3	2	2		1422/1459	3.32	3.94	4.22	4.32	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	2	1	2	0		1381/1406	3.08	3.62	4.09	4.11	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	2	3		1282/1384	3.62	3.87	4.11	4.23	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	5	2	0		1454/1489	3.18	3.81	4.17	4.18	2.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.96	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	7	2	0	2.83	1419/1463	3.23	3.78	4.09	4.18	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1203/1438	4.07	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	4	2		1396/1421	3.59	4.45	4.73	4.76	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1293/1411	3.66	3.95	4.31	4.35	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	2	3	1	2.64	1383/1405	2.69	3.90	4.32	4.34	2.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	0	7	0		1012/1236		3.78	4.00	4.03	3.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 184	3.91	4.34	4.16	4.62	****

#### Frequency Distribution

11

0 0

0 0 0 1

1

1 1

1

0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 198 3.06 3.89 4.22 4.37

0 3.50 \*\*\*\*/ 184 3.69 4.40 4.48 4.66

0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 177 2.35 3.87 4.36 4.47

1 0 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 165 2.68 3.77 4.18 4.29 \*\*\*\*

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1.3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	0						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 749

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: ENME 432L 4 University of Maryland Title Fluids/Energy Lab Eggleton,Charle Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

13

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 100	u gain ng	General w insights,skil		thia gourgo	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	2 5/	1390/1509	3.56	3.96	4.31	4.39	3.54
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	5	5	2		1326/1509	3.49	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.62
		lestions reflect	_		1	9	0	1	1	1	0		****/1287	3.49	3.98	4.30	4.38	****
		ations reflect			0	1	2	1	2	4	3		1339/1459	3.32	3.94	4.22	4.32	3.42
		eadings contribu	_	_	0	11	0	0	0	2			****/1406		3.62	4.09	4.11	****
	_	-		what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	2	3		1282/1384		3.87	4.11	4.23	3.27
		g system clearly			0	0	0	2	3	5			1223/1489		3.81	4.17	4.18	3.69
		was class cance		nea	0	4	0	0	0	1			622/1506		4.70	4.67	4.10	4.89
	_			ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	8	2			1306/1463		3.78	4.09	4.18	3.36
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overal	II teacii	ing effectiveness	4	U	U	U	0	4	1	3.30	1300/1403	3.43	3.70	4.09	4.10	3.30
		Lecture																
		actor's lectures			0	0	0	1	5	3			1311/1438		4.27	4.46	4.50	3.77
		ctor seem intere		3	0	0	1	0	9	2			1411/1421	3.59	4.45	4.73	4.76	3.15
		-		plained clearly	0	0	0	2	7	2			1325/1411		3.95	4.31	4.35	3.31
		es contribute to	_		0	4	4	3	1	0			1396/1405		3.90	4.32	4.34	2.00
5. Did au	diovisua.	l techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1195/1236	3.05	3.78	4.00	4.03	2.56
	Discussion																	
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne					0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1260	****	3.57	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were a	Were all students actively encouraged to participate				11	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1255	****	3.75	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did th	Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1258	****	3.76	4.38	4.51	****
		Laborat	torv															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understar	-	the material	0	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	178/ 184	3.91	4.34	4.16	4.62	3.08
			_	round information	0	0	2	3	6	2	0	2.62	197/ 198	3.06	3.89	4.22	4.37	2.62
_	-	_	_	r lab activities	0	0	0	3	2	8	0	3.38	178/ 184	3.69	4.40	4.48	4.66	3.38
		structor provide			0	0	8	2	2	1	0	1.69	177/ 177		3.87	4.36	4.47	1.69
		nts for lab repo			0	0	7	4	1	1	0	1.69	165/ 165		3.77	4.18	4.29	1.69
							tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27						Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	1	.1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	12
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	1
84-150																		
Grad.							ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					0						
				? 0														

3.50-4.00

3

Grad.

0

F

0

0

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Mech Engr Systems Desi

Tshibangu,Wa-Mu Fall 2009

Enrollment: 45 Questionnaires: 22

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 750 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	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	1	0	5	4	7	3	2	2 67	1495/1509	2.39	3.96	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	12	6	1		1429/1509		3.98	4.26	4.26	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	7	4		1144/1287		3.98	4.30	4.38	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	10	1		1336/1459		3.94	4.22	4.32	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	6	3	4	1	0		1401/1406		3.62	4.09	4.11	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		2	1	1	7	5	4		1168/1384		3.87		4.23	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	4	5	7	1		1429/1489		3.81	4.17	4.18	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6			896/1506		4.70	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	4	10	5	1		1367/1463		3.78	4.09	4.18	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	10	4	3.86	1282/1438	3.62	4.27	4.46	4.50	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	1312/1421	4.06	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	7	5	3.65	1239/1411	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.35	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	5	8	3	3.29	1315/1405	3.43	3.90	4.32	4.34	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	4	5	4	2	3.00	1131/1236	2.67	3.78	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	3	1	1		1203/1260		3.57	4.14	4.25	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	1	3		1067/1255		3.75	4.33	4.46	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00			3.76	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.00	3.68	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	1 67	<b>4444/10</b> 4		4 24	4 16	4 60	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 184		4.34	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	2	1	0		****/ 198		3.89	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19 19	1 1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 184 ****/ 177		4.40	4.48	$4.66 \\ 4.47$	****
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	19	1	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 165		3.87 3.77	4.36 4.18	4.47	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 13		Red	 guire	ed f	or M	aior	 s 1	8	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	17
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4							_	-		-	-	) (		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 0		_	nera:	,				0	Under-g	, -	22		major	5

Electives

0

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

I 0 Other 0 ? 1

Course-Section: ENME 444 2 University of Maryland Title Mech Engr Systems Desi

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 751

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Tshibangu,Wa-Mu

Instructor:

Quebeion	naireb. i		beddelle coe	AL DC	DVa1	uu c i c	J11 Q.	ucb c l	. 011110								
						Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
		General															
_	-	nsights,skills f		0	0	0	1	0	0	0		1508/1509	2.39	3.96	4.31	4.39	2.00
		make clear the	1 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1086/1509	3.60	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.00
	_	ions reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	3.36	3.98	4.30	4.38	4.00
		ons reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		3.64	3.94	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did a	ssigned readi	ngs contribute to	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		1401/1406		3.62	4.09	4.11	2.00
6. Did w	ritten assign	ments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.35	3.87	4.11	4.23	3.00
7. Was t	he grading sy	stem clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	3.29	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How m	any times was	class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.40	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How w	ould you grad	le the overall te	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1392/1463	3.38	3.78	4.09	4.18	3.00
		Lecture															
		r's lectures wel		0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1203/1438		4.27	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did t	he instructor	seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1345/1421		4.45	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was l	ecture materi	al presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did t	he lectures c	ontribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	3.43	3.90	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did a	udiovisual te	chniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	2.67	3.78	4.00	4.03	4.00
		Discussion															
			o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1162/1260		3.57	4.14	4.25	3.00
			ged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1202/1255		3.75	4.33	4.46	3.00
		-	and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1222/1258		3.76	4.38	4.51	3.00
4. Were	special techn	iques successful		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.68	4.03	4.26	3.00
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	2			Tv	ne			Majors	

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

Course-Section: ENME 444 3 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Title Mech Engr Systems Desi Instructor: Tshibangu, Wa-Mu

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 752

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1503/1509	2.39	3.96	4.31	4.39	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1372/1509	3.60	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1283/1287	3.36	3.98	4.30	4.38	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1314/1459	3.64	3.94	4.22	4.32	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1392/1406	2.17	3.62	4.09	4.11	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1192/1384	3.35	3.87	4.11	4.23	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	3.29	3.81	4.17	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.40	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	853/1463	3.38	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1406/1438	3.62	4.27	4.46	4.50	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1345/1421	4.06	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	3.88	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1348/1405	3.43	3.90	4.32	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1235/1236	2.67	3.78	4.00	4.03	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Ο	1	1	0	3 50	1045/1260	3.12	3.57	4.14	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1127/1255	3.40	3.75	4.33	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	620/1258		3.76	4.38	4.51	4.50

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

Title Controls/Vib Lab

Instructor: Tasch,Uri Enrollment:

30 Questionnaires: 24

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 753 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollive')	Evaluation	Ougetion	n $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$

Questions				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 4 9 10 4.17 9/6/1509 4.17 3.96 4.31 4.39 4.17 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 15 4.46 495/1509 4.54 3.98 4.26 4.26 4.54 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 2 5 16 4.46 578/1287 4.46 3.98 4.30 4.38 4.46 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 3 8 11 4.26 759/1459 4.26 3.94 4.22 4.22 4.26 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 2 0 2 3 3 3 3 64 1122/1406 3.64 3.62 4.09 4.11 3.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 7 13 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.87 4.11 4.23 4.39 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 2 5 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 1 2 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 1 9 4.75 881/1421 4.75 4.45 4.37 4.76 4.75 7. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 1 4 4.66 677/1411 4.46 3.95 4.31 4.35 4.64 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 437/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.55 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 437/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.57 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 7. Mere applicate contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 4 9 10 4.17 9/6/1509 4.17 3.96 4.31 4.39 4.17 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 15 4.46 495/1509 4.54 3.98 4.26 4.26 4.54 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 0 2 5 16 4.46 578/1287 4.46 3.98 4.30 4.38 4.46 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 3 8 11 4.26 759/1459 4.26 3.94 4.22 4.22 4.26 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 2 0 2 3 3 3 3 64 1122/1406 3.64 3.62 4.09 4.11 3.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 7 13 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.87 4.11 4.23 4.39 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 2 5 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 1 2 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 1 9 4.75 881/1421 4.75 4.45 4.37 4.76 4.75 7. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 1 4 4.66 677/1411 4.46 3.95 4.31 4.35 4.64 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 437/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.55 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 437/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.57 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 7. Mere applicate contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 15 4.54 495/1509 4.54 3.98 4.26 4.26 4.54 4.54 1.06 4.06 1.06 1.06 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07 1.07		0	0	0	1	1	0	1.0	1 17	076/1500	1 17	2 06	1 21	4 20	1 17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 1 0 2 5 16 4.46 578/1287 4.46 3.98 4.30 4.38 4.46 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 1 3 8 11 4.26 759/1459 4.26 3.94 4.22 4.32 4.26 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 12 0 2 3 3 3 3.64 1122/1406 3.64 3.62 4.09 4.11 3.64 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 7 13 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.87 4.11 4.28 4.39 1.87 4.29 4.29 1.20 4.29 1.20 4.29 1.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4			-	-	_		9								
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 2 1 5 15 4.43 555/1489 4.43 3.81 4.17 4.18 4.43 9. How many times was class cancelled 1. O 0 0 0 0 2 3 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.70 4.67 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. D 0 1 2 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. O 0 0 0 1 5 17 4.70 545/1438 4.70 4.27 4.46 4.50 4.70 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the material 8. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			-	-	-	_	/			,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 7 13 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.64 1.14 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.11 4.23 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.67 4.12 4.57 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00							5								
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. 0 0 0 1 2 7 13 4.39 453/1384 4.39 3.87 4.11 4.23 4.39 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 1 5 15 4.43 555/1489 4.43 3.81 4.17 4.18 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.70 4.67 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 1 2 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 17 4.70 545/1438 4.70 4.27 4.46 4.50 4.70 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 19 4.75 881/1421 4.75 4.45 4.73 4.76 4.75 2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 9 12 4.29 866/1405 4.29 3.90 4.32 4.34 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 2. Were special techniques successful  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/1258 4.57 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0	<u> </u>			-			8			,					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 1 5 15 4.43 555/1489 4.43 3.81 4.17 4.18 4.43 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 1 5 7 4.20 500/1463 4.20 3.78 4.07 4.67 5.00 4.07 4.67 5.00 4.07 4.67 5.00 4.07 4.67 5.00 4.07 4.00 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 0 0 2 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20 Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 17 4.70 545/1438 4.70 4.27 4.46 4.50 4.70 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0							3								
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 23 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.70 4.67 4.67 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 1 2 5 7 4.20 690/1463 4.20 3.78 4.09 4.18 4.20   Lecture			-	-			7								
Lecture   Lect			-	-		_	5								
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		_	•	-	-	-	•			,					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 5 17 4.70 545/1438 4.70 4.27 4.46 4.50 4.70 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 4 19 4.75 881/1421 4.75 4.45 4.73 4.76 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 7 14 4.46 6677/1411 4.46 63.95 4.31 4.35 4.46 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 1 9 12 4.29 866/1405 4.29 3.90 4.32 4.34 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.76 4.38 4.51 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 4 0 0 0 0 2 5 5.00 ****/873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	Τ	0	Т	2	5	./	4.20	690/1463	4.20	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 4 19 4.75 881/1421 4.75 4.45 4.73 4.76 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 7 14 4.46 677/1411 4.46 3.95 4.31 4.35 4.46 4.95 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2.84 Each of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3.89 Each of the lab instructor provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3.89 Each of the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 10 4.75 53/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.71 ****  2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.84 ****	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 1 4 19 4.75 881/1421 4.75 4.45 4.73 4.76 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 7 14 4.46 677/1411 4.46 3.95 4.31 4.35 4.46 4.95 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2.84 Each of the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3.01 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3.89 Each of the lab instructor provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3.89 Each of the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 10 4.75 53/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.71 ****  2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.84 ****	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	545/1438	4.70	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 7 14 4.46 677/1411 4.46 3.95 4.31 4.35 4.46 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 1 9 12 4.29 866/1405 4.29 3.90 4.32 4.34 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3.89 4.20 4.67 4.50 4.60 4.75 4.50 4.60 4.50 4.75 4.50 4.60 4.75 4.50 4.60 4.75 4.50 4.60 4.75 4.50 4.60 4.75 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70		0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 1 9 12 4.29 866/1405 4.29 3.90 4.32 4.34 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 2 6 10 4.32 441/1236 4.32 3.78 4.00 4.03 4.32    Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.76 4.38 4.51 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2.5 Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.50 did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.50 did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.50 did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 ****	3						7			,					
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.66 4.38 4.51 **** 4.60 **** 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/ 184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 4.71 **** 4.71 **** 4.71 **** 4.71 **** 4.71 **** 4.71 **** 4.72 *** 4.73 **** 4.74 *** 4.74 *** 4.75 *							9								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.76 4.38 4.51 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/ 184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/ 198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.75 53/ 184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/ 177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/ 165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.50 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.50 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****							-								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 1 0 0 0 4 3.83 896/1260 3.83 3.57 4.14 4.25 3.83 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.76 4.38 4.51 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/ 184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/ 198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.75 53/ 184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/ 177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/ 165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.50 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.50 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 443/1255 4.67 3.75 4.33 4.46 4.67 3.0 bid the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.76 4.38 4.51 **** 4.88 4.89 4.80 6 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27    Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.54 4.83 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.38 4.64 **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4.															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1258 **** 3.76 4.38 4.51 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 18 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 873 **** 3.68 4.03 4.26 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/ 184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/ 198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 53/ 184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/ 177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/ 165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****		18	-			0	0	4	3.83	896/1260	3.83	3.57	4.14	4.25	3.83
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3.80 Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****		18	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	443/1255	4.67	3.75	4.33	4.46	4.67
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45  5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0		0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1258	****	3.76	4.38	4.51	***
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27 Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****	4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.68	4.03	4.26	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 37/184 4.67 4.34 4.16 4.62 4.67 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27 Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 2 5 4 3.92 150/198 3.92 3.89 4.22 4.37 3.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27 Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****		1 2	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	0	1 67	27/ 10/	1 67	1 21	1 16	1 62	1 67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 4.75 53/184 4.75 4.40 4.48 4.66 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****								-							
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 1 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 91/177 4.45 3.87 4.36 4.47 4.45 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13 0 0 1 2 1 7 4.27 79/165 4.27 3.77 4.18 4.29 4.27  Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****															
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.50 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****						_	_								
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 **** **** 4.49 4.71 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 90 **** **** 4.50 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****			_	-	-	-	_	-		. ,					
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 89 *** *** 4.49 4.71 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 *** *** 4.54 4.83 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 90 *** *** 4.50 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 *** *** 4.38 4.64 ****	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1.3	U	U	1	2	Т	/	4.2/	79/ 105	4.27	3.//	4.18	4.29	4.27
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.54 4.83 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 90 **** **** 4.50 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****	Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 90 **** **** 4.50 4.69 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****	2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 92 **** **** 4.38 4.64 ****	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
			0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
		23	0	0	0	0	1	0			****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Frequency Distribution	Fram	en cv	· Diet	rib	ıtior	1									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENME 488 16 Special Problems Fall 2009 Instructor: Carmi, Shlomo

Title

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

0

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 754 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

	-		A
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.96	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.98	4.26	4.26	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	3.98	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	3.94	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1401/1406	2.00	3.62	4.09	4.11	2.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.00	3.87	4.11	4.23	3.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1481/1489	2.00	3.81	4.17	4.18	2.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	3.78	4.09	4.18	5.00		
		Lecture		_														
		actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.27	4.46	4.50	5.00
		ctor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00
		-		explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	3.95	4.31	4.35	5.00
		es contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1405	5.00	3.90	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.78	4.00	4.03	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	}			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

Course-Section: ENME 489 1 University of Maryland Title Spec Topics In Mech En

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Farquhar, Anthon Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 19

Page 755 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions				MD	NA		equer 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
			.s 															
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	574/1509	4.40	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.53
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	817/1509	4.02	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.29
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	903/1287	3.95	3.98	4.30	4.38	4.06
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	792/1459	4.05	3.94	4.22	4.32	4.24
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	2	5	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1147/1406	3.86	3.62	4.09	4.11	3.58
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	3	2	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	718/1384	4.05	3.87	4.11	4.23	4.14
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y explai	ned	2	0	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	1162/1489	3.75	3.81	4.17	4.18	3.82
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.67	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How wor	uld you 🤉	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	523/1463	4.08	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.36
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	9			839/1438			4.46		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	17		1/1421		4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clear.  Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1		4	4.18		4.20	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.18
			-		2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	. ,			4.32	4.34	
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	4	8	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	664/1236	4.20	3.78	4.00	4.03	4.00
		- ·																
1 541		Discus		3	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/1000	2 50	2 57	1 1 1	4 05	****
				what you learned	18 18	0	0	0	0	1			****/1260					****
				l to participate l open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1255 ****/1258		3.75	4.33		****
3. DIG CHE	e Instruc	ctor encourage	Tall all	open discussion	10	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/1256	3.09	3.70	4.30	4.51	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	ne			Majors	
00-27							quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	4	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	17
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4																	
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1					Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	2
84-150																		
Grad.							ecti	ves			1	.0	#### - 1				_	h
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ufican	it	
	I O					Ot.	her					0						
	? 1																	

Course-Section: ENME 489 2 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Spec Topics In Mech En

Instructor: Waikar,Shailesh

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 756

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			E			_		T to a d		G	Damb	IIMDG	T 1	00
O combilers a	NTD	377	1	equer		5 1	_		ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.40	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.02	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	924/1287	3.95	3.98	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1192/1459	4.05	3.94	4.22	4.32	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1105/1406	3.86	3.62	4.09	4.11	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	619/1384	4.05	3.87	4.11	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1197/1489	3.75	3.81	4.17	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	845/1506	4.67	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	628/1463	4.08	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	800/1438	4.47	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.84	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	885/1411	4.20	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.34	3.90	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	664/1236	4.20	3.78	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1045/1260	3.58	3.57	4.14	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1054/1255	3.65	3.75	4.33	4.46	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1143/1258	3.69	3.76	4.38	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	3.64	3.68	4.03	4.26	4.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

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

Spec Topics In Mech En

Instructor: Mogavero, Marc A

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 27

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 757 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	10	12	4.22	911/1509	4.40	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	699/1509	4.02	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	9	14	4.26	779/1287	3.95	3.98	4.30	4.38	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	686/1459	4.05	3.94	4.22	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	7	9	5	3.48	1189/1406	3.86	3.62	4.09	4.11	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	6	3	9	6	3.42	1226/1384	4.05	3.87	4.11	4.23	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	352/1489	3.75	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	4.41	1166/1506	4.67	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	10	9	4.22	668/1463	4.08	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	480/1438	4.47	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	23	4.81	794/1421	4.84	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	13	10	4.23	902/1411	4.20	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	13	4.31	859/1405	4.34	3.90	4.32	4.34	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	6	5	12	4.17	563/1236	4.20	3.78	4.00	4.03	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1260	3.58	3.57	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1255	3.65	3.75	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1258	3.69	3.76	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.64	3.68	4.03	4.26	****

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland

Spec Topics In Mech En Baltimore Co

Instructor: Ma, Ronghui

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

Title

Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 758 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quanting			Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	1	7	3.86	1251/1509	4.40	3.96	4.31	4.39	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	2	6		1240/1509	4.02	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	5	4		1123/1287	3.95	3.98	4.30	4.38	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	1	1	7		1077/1459	4.05	3.94	4.22	4.32	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	1	5	4	3.92			3.62	4.09	4.11	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	659/1384	4.05	3.87	4.11	4.23	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	4		1082/1489	3.75	3.81	4.17	4.18	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4		4.71		4.67	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	608/1463	4.08	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	950/1438	4.47	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	1072/1421	4.84	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1170/1411	4.20	3.95	4.31	4.35	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	1047/1405	4.34	3.90	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	607/1236	4.20	3.78	4.00	4.03	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	982/1260		3.57	4.14	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	1	3		1115/1255	3.65	3.75	4.33	4.46	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	1	4		1021/1258	3.69	3.76	4.38		3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	765/ 873	3.64	3.68	4.03	4.26	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.34	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.40	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	3.87	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	3.77	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work								4 00				4 00		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced		_		_			_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Title Spec Topics In Mech En

Instructor: Ma,Ronghui

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 758 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General		Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				?	1						

Spec Topics In Mech En

Instructor: Su, Haijun

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 759 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	g		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	767/1509	4.40	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	796/1509	4.02	3.98	4.26	4.26	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	614/1287	3.95	3.98	4.30	4.38	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	945/1459	4.05	3.94	4.22	4.32	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	813/1406	3.86	3.62	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	9	4	3.94	886/1384	4.05	3.87	4.11	4.23	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	619/1489	3.75	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	602/1506	4.67	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	826/1463	4.08	3.78	4.09	4.18	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	904/1438	4.47	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	562/1421	4.84	4.45	4.73	4.76	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	- 8	4.37	779/1411	4.20	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	733/1405	4.34	3.90	4.32	4.34	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	3			3.93	741/1236			4.00	4.03	
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	3.58	3.57	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1255	3.65	3.75	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1258	3.69	3.76	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	3.64	3.68	4.03	4.26	****
- 1														
Laboratory	1.0	0	•	•	0	•	-	F 00	**** / 100	ate ate ate ate	2 00	4 00	4 25	ale ale ale ale
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.69	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	Ο	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
oord onere enough proceeds for all the beautiful	-0	J	•	J	J	J	_	3.00	, 30			1.2/	1.55	

Spec Topics In Mech En

Instructor: Su, Haijun

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 759 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General (		Under-grad	19	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: ENME 489 8 University of Maryland Page 760 Title Spec Topics In Mech En Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Spence, Anne M

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Ctudent	Course	Fraluation	Questionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	410/1509	4.40	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1419/1509	4.02	3.98	4.26	4.26	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1204/1287	3.95	3.98	4.30	4.38	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	979/1459	4.05	3.94	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	332/1406	3.86	3.62	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	531/1384	4.05	3.87	4.11	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1481/1489	3.75	3.81	4.17	4.18	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1205/1506	4.67	4.70	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1314/1463	4.08	3.78	4.09	4.18	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1001/1438	4.47	4.27	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.84	4.45	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	810/1411	4.20	3.95	4.31	4.35	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	828/1405	4.34	3.90	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	4.20	3.78	4.00	4.03	5.00

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

Course-Section: ENME 645 1 University of Maryland Title Appl Comp Thermo/Fluid Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Jiang,Weiyuan

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 761

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	
		Genera																
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	2	0	3	1		1464/1509		3.96		4.39	3.14
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	2	1	1		1487/1509	2.86	3.98	4.26	4.25	2.86
		ations reflect			0	1	0	2	3	0	1		1422/1459	3.00	3.94	4.22	4.16	3.00
				what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	1	1		1369/1406		3.62	4.09	4.12	2.80
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	2	2	3.43	1226/1384	3.43	3.87	4.11	4.16	3.43
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1430/1489	2.83	3.81	4.17	4.14	2.83
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1456/1506	3.86	4.70	4.67	4.71	3.86
9. How wo	uld you s	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1454/1463	2.00	3.78	4.09	4.15	2.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1330/1438	3.71	4.27	4.46	4.49	3.71
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.45	4.73	4.78	4.71
				explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	1	1		1383/1411		3.95	4.31	4.33	2.83
		es contribute t			1	0	3	0	1	1	1		1388/1405		3.90	4.32	4.33	2.50
				our understanding	1		0	0	0	1	1		274/1236		3.78	4.00	3.98	4.50
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	5	0	1	Λ	1	Λ	0	2 00	1257/1260	2.00	3.57	4.14	4.21	2.00
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	1		- ,	4.00	3.75	4.33	4.43	4.00
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	0		1143/1258	3.50	3.76	4.38	4.50	3.50
		chniques succe		d open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	0		-,		3.70	4.03		3.00
				Frequ		- Di	la-		_									
				Frequ	lency	DIS	CLID	ucio.	[1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	guir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	1	 Graduat	 e	4	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						J						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				3	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				5	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-		-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
												•	_ COP 011D		91			

Other

0

Ι

0

Course-Section: ENME 662 1

Linear Vibrations Baltimore Coun

Title Linear Vibra Instructor: Zhu, Weidong

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 762 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		ot UMBC Level		Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	711/1509	4.41	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	519/1509	4.53	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	315/1287	4.71	3.98	4.30	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	454/1459	4.50	3.94	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	897/1406	3.93	3.62	4.09	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	466/1384	4.38	3.87	4.11	4.16	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	12	4.47	499/1489	4.47	3.81	4.17	4.14	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.70	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	702/1463	4.19	3.78	4.09	4.15	4.19
Lecture	•	0	•	•	-	_	1.0	4 50	BBE /1.420	4 50	4 00	4 46	4 40	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1438	4.53	4.27	4.46	4.49	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.45	4.73	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	4		4.18	950/1411	4.18	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1			4.59	558/1405	4.59	3.90	4.32	4.33	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	824/1236	3.80	3.78	4.00	3.98	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1045/1260	3.50	3.57	4.14	4.21	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	575/1255	4.50	3.75	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	742/1258	4.38	3.76	4.38	4.50	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.68		4.01	4.00
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.34	4.16	4.07	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.40	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 177	****	3.87	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 165	****	3.77	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
••• ··· • J ····· •		_	-	-	-	-	_		,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.45	****
0.15 01														
Self Paced	1 -	0	0	0	0	2	^	4 00	****/ 49	****	****	1 26	1 10	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2 1	0	4.00	****/ 49 ****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
<ol> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> </ol>	15 15	0	0	0	1 1	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.14 4.31	4.08 4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.31	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	4.26	****
J. WOLG CHOICE CHOUGH PLOCEOUS TOT ALL CHE SCUUCHES	10	U	U	J	_	Т	U	5.50	/ 30			1.4/	7.40	

Course-Section: ENME 662 1

Title Linear Vibrations

Instructor: Zhu, Weidong
Enrollment: 25

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 762 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	 5	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 670 1 University of Maryland Title Continuum Mechanics

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 763

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Erdem, Ali U. Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 4 1	0 1 0 2 0 1 2	2 3 3 0 1 1	2 0 1 3 1 2	2 2 4 4 3 4	4 4 2 0 1 1	3.50 3.50 3.00 3.67 3.33	1288/150 1372/150 1168/128 1422/145 1105/140 1264/138 1398/148	9 3.50 7 3.50 9 3.00 6 3.67 4 3.33	3.96 3.98 3.98 3.94 3.62 3.87 3.81	4.31 4.26 4.30 4.22 4.09 4.11 4.17	4.39 4.25 4.22 4.16 4.12 4.16 4.14	3.80 3.50 3.50 3.67 3.33 3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 1	0	0 3	0	0 1	0	10 5	5.00 3.44	1/150 1273/146		4.70 3.78	4.67 4.09	4.71 4.15	5.00 3.44
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 8	0 0 1 1 0	0 0 1 1 0	2 1 3 2 0	4 3 3 2 1	4 6 2 4 0	4.50 3.40 3.70	1116/143 1162/142 1309/141 1206/140 ****/123	1 4.50 1 3.40 5 3.70	4.27 4.45 3.95 3.90 3.78	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32 4.00	4.49 4.78 4.33 4.33 3.98	4.20 4.50 3.40 3.70 ****
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	2 2 2 2	0 0 0 6	1 2 2 1	2 2 2 1	3 4 4 0	2 0 0	0 0 0	2.25 2.25	1212/126 1249/125 1253/125 ****/ 87	5 2.25 8 2.25	3.57 3.75 3.76 3.68	4.14 4.33 4.38 4.03	4.21 4.43 4.50 4.01	2.75 2.25 2.25 ****
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9 9	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00 5.00	, -	-	**** ****	4.39 4.41	4.36 4.40	*** ***
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8 9 9	0 0 0	1 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	0 0 0	4.00	****/ 4 ****/ 4 ****/ 4	1 ****	* * * * * * * * * * * *	4.26 4.14 4.31	4.16 4.08 4.11	* * * * * * * * * * * *
Frequency Constitution Constitu	ıency	Dis	trib										26	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		 Re	 auir		asons  or Ma			 8	T  Gradua	ype  te	 8	 Majc	Majors  r	10
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0			nera		01 110	.,02,		1	Under-		2	_	-major	0
Grad. 8 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ecti her	ves				0		Means to l			_	h

Course-Section: ENME 680 1 University of Maryland Title Experimental Mechanics

Baltimore County

Instructor: Arola,Dwayne D

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 764 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies			Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	nı dain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	410/1	500	4.67	3.96	4.31	4.39	4.67
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	234/1		4.78	3.98	4.26	4.25	4.78
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67			4.67	3.98	4.30	4.22	4.67
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	280/1		4.67	3.94	4.22	4.16	4.67
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57			4.57	3.62	4.09	4.12	4.57
	_	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	313/1		4.56	3.87	4.11	4.16	4.56
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	1	7		,		4.67	3.81	4.17	4.14	4.67
		was class canc			0	1	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	973/1		4.63	4.70	4.67	4.71	4.63
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63				3.78	4.09		4.63
1 77	and the same	Lectur	-		0	^	0	_	0	0	_	F 00	1 /1	420	F 00	4 05	1 10	4 40	F 00
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00		.438	5.00	4.27	4.46		5.00
		tor seem inter		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00		.421	5.00	4.45	4.73	4.78	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.67	416/1		4.67	3.95	4.31	4.33	4.67
		s contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1		4.78	3.90	4.32	4.33	4.78
5. Did au	ıdıovısual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	466/1	.236	4.29	3.78	4.00	3.98	4.29
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	lass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	415/1	.260	4.50	3.57	4.14	4.21	4.50
2. Were a	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1	.255	4.50	3.75	4.33	4.43	4.50
				nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	620/1	.258	4.50	3.76	4.38	4.50	4.50
4. Were s	special te	chniques succe	ssful		6	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	873	****	3.68	4.03	4.01	****
		Labora	torv																
1. Did th	ne lab inc		_	of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/	184	4.75	4.34	4.16	4.07	4.75
				ground information	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	32/		4.75	3.89	4.22	4.31	4.75
				for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	105/		4.50	4.40	4.48	4.11	4.50
		tructor provid			5	0	0	0	0	1	3		46/		4.75	3.87	4.36	4.41	4.75
				early specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/	165	5.00	3.77	4.18	4.25	5.00
		Semina	~																
1. Were a	assigned t			announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ut i o	n										
				ricqu	cricy	DIB	CLID	acio.											
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons					Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	4	Grad	luate	 e	3	Majo	 or	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			-									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad	6	Non-	-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0										_				-	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				3	####	ŧ - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					1	_						
				? 0															