```
Course-Section: ENME 110  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  790
Title       STATICS                          Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SPENCE, ANNE M                     Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   26
Questionnaires: 21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  1  2  4 13  4.29  964/1670  4.41  3.87  4.31  4.23  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  3  6 11  4.24  991/1666  4.26  3.79  4.27  4.30  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  5 13  4.43  691/1406  4.52  3.91  4.32  4.31  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  1  1  1  8  7  4.06 1055/1615  4.13  3.89  4.24  4.17  4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  1  1  4 13  4.35  540/1566  4.13  3.39  4.07  4.03  4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5  1  1  5  1  8  3.88 1063/1528  4.00  3.79  4.12  4.00  3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  2  8  3  8  3.81 1330/1650  4.08  3.89  4.22  4.28  3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   1  0  0  0 17  3  4.15 1437/1667  4.20  4.78  4.67  4.61  4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  1  1 10  5  4.12  888/1626  4.15  3.63  4.11  4.07  4.12


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  4  3 14  4.48  933/1559  4.47  4.07  4.46  4.47  4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  3 17  4.76  929/1560  4.75  4.38  4.72  4.68  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  1  4  4 11  4.10 1108/1549  4.03  3.68  4.31  4.32  4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1  1  0  3  1 14  4.42  822/1546  4.20  3.57  4.32  4.32  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  2  2  3  4 10  3.86  857/1323  3.89  3.55  4.00  3.91  3.86


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  1  0  1  2 15  4.58  390/1384  4.46  3.36  4.10  3.92  4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  1  1  1  8  8  4.11  932/1378  3.94  3.57  4.29  4.09  4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  1  1  2  4 11  4.21  888/1378  4.05  3.52  4.31  4.08  4.21
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   6  1  0  0  4  8  4.38  300/ 904  3.51  3.38  4.03  3.94  4.38


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  20  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  20  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  38  ****  2.50  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        20  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  38  ****  4.50  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    19  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  ****  4.00  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  20  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  ****  4.00  4.47  4.28  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      20  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****

                            Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    6      0.00-0.99   0      A   11      Required for Majors  0     Graduate    0     Major      12
  28-55    4      1.00-1.99   0      B    7                                 Under-grad  21    Non-major   9
  56-83    1      2.00-2.99   2      C    0      General              0
  84-150   0      3.00-3.49   3      D    0
  Grad.    0      3.50-4.00   7      F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                responses to be significant
                                     I    0      Other               18
                                     ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 110  0103                University of Maryland                              Page  791
Title       STATICS                           Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    SPENCE, ANNE M                 Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires: 26                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean   Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    5   0  1  0  2  6  12  4.33   902/1670  4.41  3.87  4.31  4.23  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     5   0  0  0  2  8  11  4.43   751/1666  4.26  3.79  4.27  4.30  4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    5   0  0  0  1  8  12  4.52   576/1406  4.52  3.91  4.32  4.31  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     5   2  0  0  4  7   8  4.21   922/1615  4.13  3.89  4.24  4.17  4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5   1  0  1  7  6   6  3.85  1059/1566  4.13  3.39  4.07  4.03  3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 7  0  0  4  5   5  4.07   859/1528  4.00  3.79  4.12  4.00  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             5   0  1  0  1  7  12  4.38   744/1650  4.08  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                   5   0  0  0  1 14   6  4.24  1381/1667  4.20  4.78  4.67  4.61  4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 1 0  0  3  5   7  4.27   716/1626  4.15  3.63  4.11  4.07  4.27


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         6   0  0  0  2  5  13  4.55   834/1559  4.47  4.07  4.46  4.47  4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    6   0  0  0  1  5  14  4.65  1102/1560  4.75  4.38  4.72  4.68  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6   0  0  0  6  7   7  4.05  1125/1549  4.03  3.68  4.31  4.32  4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   0  1  1  4  5   9  4.00  1139/1546  4.20  3.57  4.32  4.32  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6  3  2  1  1  6   7  3.88   834/1323  3.89  3.55  4.00  3.91  3.88


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7   0  1  1  4  3  10  4.05   808/1384  4.46  3.36  4.10  3.92  4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7   0  1  2  8  3   5  3.47  1203/1378  3.94  3.57  4.29  4.09  3.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  1  2  6  4   6  3.63  1156/1378  4.05  3.52  4.31  4.08  3.63
4. Were special techniques successful                   7  12  0  1  4  2   0  3.14   812/ 904  3.51  3.38  4.03  3.94  3.14


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material    25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 232  ****  3.81  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 239  ****  3.64  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 230  ****  3.57  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance             25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 231  ****  3.80  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/ 218  ****  3.39  4.18  4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  87  ****  ****  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  79  ****  4.50  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  75  ****  3.50  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  79  ****  3.00  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  80  ****  4.00  3.97  3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria   25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  38  ****  2.50  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation         25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  38  ****  4.50  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations     25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  39  ****  4.00  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  31  ****  4.00  4.47  4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful        25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students       25  0  0  0  0  1   0  4.00  ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENME 110  0104            University of Maryland                         Page  792
Title       STATICS                         Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SPENCE, ANNE M                   Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   35
Questionnaires: 18              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  7  11  4.61  544/1670  4.41  3.87  4.31  4.23  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1 11   5  4.11 1125/1666  4.26  3.79  4.27  4.30  4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  7  11  4.61  483/1406  4.52  3.91  4.32  4.31  4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  3  7   5  4.13 1000/1615  4.13  3.89  4.24  4.17  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  0  4  6   7  4.18  724/1566  4.13  3.39  4.07  4.03  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  2  0  2  2  4   7  4.07  864/1528  4.00  3.79  4.12  4.00  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  2  1  9   6  4.06 1107/1650  4.08  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1 12   5  4.22 1388/1667  4.20  4.78  4.67  4.61  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  1  0  0  2 10   3  4.07  921/1626  4.15  3.63  4.11  4.07  4.07


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  1  0  8   9  4.39 1042/1559  4.47  4.07  4.46  4.47  4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  1  16  4.83  777/1560  4.75  4.38  4.72  4.68  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  1  2  7   6  3.94 1200/1549  4.03  3.68  4.31  4.32  3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  1  1  6   9  4.17 1056/1546  4.20  3.57  4.32  4.32  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  1  1  1  8   5  3.94  781/1323  3.89  3.55  4.00  3.91  3.94


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  4  12  4.75  257/1384  4.46  3.36  4.10  3.92  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  3  6   7  4.25  860/1378  3.94  3.57  4.29  4.09  4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  3  5   8  4.31  831/1378  4.05  3.52  4.31  4.08  4.31
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   9  1  1  3  1   1  3.00  820/ 904  3.51  3.38  4.03  3.94  3.00
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    9       0.00-0.99    0        A   9       Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0         Major      14
 28-55    2       1.00-1.99    1        B   4                                                          
 56-83    1       2.00-2.99    4        C   3       General              1      Under-grad   18        Non-major   4
 84-150   0       3.00-3.49    5        D   0                                                          
 Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    3        F   0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other               16
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 204  0101                University of Maryland                         Page  793
Title          INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C              Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    SU, HAIJUN                          Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 22                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   6   0   0   2   7   3   4  3.56 1521/1670  3.80 3.87  4.31 4.32  3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    7   0   0   1   5   6   3  3.73 1419/1666  3.75 3.79  4.27 4.27  3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   7   0   0   0   1   9   5  4.27  868/1406  4.18 3.91  4.32 4.39  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    7   0   0   1   3   6   5  4.00 1083/1615  3.89 3.89  4.24 4.29  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6  4   3   3   4   1   1  2.50 1537/1566  2.58 3.39  4.07 4.00  2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 1  0   3   2   6   4  3.73 1164/1528  3.60 3.79  4.12 4.11  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            6   0   0   4   3   5   4  3.56 1442/1650  3.89 3.89  4.22 4.20  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  6   0   0   0   0   0  16  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.78  4.67 4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0   1   4   7   1  3.62 1341/1626  3.62 3.63  4.11 4.06  3.62


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0   0   0   1   6   9  4.50  896/1559  4.45 4.07  4.46 4.40  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6   0   0   0   2   6   8  4.38 1347/1560  4.59 4.38  4.72 4.73  4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0   1   1   6   4   4  3.56 1374/1549  3.57 3.68  4.31 4.25  3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0   2   2   3   6   3  3.38 1417/1546  3.69 3.57  4.32 4.30  3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0  0   0   4   3   9  4.31  498/1323  4.06 3.55  4.00 4.08  4.31


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  0   1   2   2   5  4.10  796/1384  3.43 3.36  4.10 4.07  4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  0   2   3   3   2  3.50 1193/1378  3.39 3.57  4.29 4.25  3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 1   3   3   1   2  3.00 1304/1378  3.28 3.52  4.31 4.26  3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   0   2   1   1   3   3  3.40  761/ 904  3.46 3.38  4.03 4.01  3.40


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16   0   1   0   0   3   2  3.83  175/ 232  3.68 3.81  4.19 4.35  3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0  1   2   0   3  3.83  180/ 239  3.34 3.64  4.21 4.33  3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 1   1   1   0   3  3.50  217/ 230  3.05 3.57  4.44 4.61  3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           16   0   0   1   1   1   3  4.00  159/ 231  3.80 3.80  4.31 4.52  4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16   0   0   2   1   0   3  3.67  184/ 218  3.36 3.39  4.18 4.25  3.67

                                    Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0        A   12        Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0        Major       16
  28-55     2       1.00-1.99   0        B    3                                                           
  56-83     5       2.00-2.99   4        C    1        General               0      Under-grad  22        Non-major    6
  84-150    2       3.00-3.49   4        D    0                                                           
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   3        F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                15
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 204  0102           University of Maryland                        Page  794
Title        INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C       Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SU, HAIJUN                    Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     15
Questionnaires:  8                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions              NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  2  3  3  4.13 1139/1670  3.80  3.87  4.31  4.32  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  4  2  4.00 1199/1666  3.75  3.79  4.27  4.27  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  751/1406  4.18  3.91  4.32  4.39  4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  1  2  2  3  3.88 1252/1615  3.89  3.89  4.24  4.29  3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  2  3  2  0  2.75 1527/1566  2.58  3.39  4.07  4.00  2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 3 2  3.75 1152/1528  3.60  3.79  4.12  4.11  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  3  4  4.38  757/1650  3.89  3.89  4.22  4.20  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  8  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.78  4.67  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 6 1 4.00  953/1626  3.62  3.63  4.11  4.06  4.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  739/1559  4.45  4.07  4.46  4.40  4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  673/1560  4.59  4.38  4.72  4.73  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 5 0  3.63 1358/1549  3.57  3.68  4.31  4.25  3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  879/1546  3.69  3.57  4.32  4.30  4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 2 2 4  4.25  545/1323  4.06  3.55  4.00  4.08  4.25


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 1 2 1 0  2.60 1327/1384  3.43  3.36  4.10  4.07  2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 2 0 1 2  3.60 1156/1378  3.39  3.57  4.29  4.25  3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 1 0 0 3 1 3.60 1165/1378  3.28  3.52  4.31  4.26  3.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  0  0  0  3  1  1  3.60  698/ 904  3.46  3.38  4.03  4.01  3.60


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  3  0  0  1  2  1  1  3.40  210/ 232  3.68  3.81  4.19  4.35  3.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 1 1 2 3.60 210/ 239  3.34  3.64  4.21  4.33  3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 1 1 2 1 0 2.60  228/ 230  3.05  3.57  4.44  4.61  2.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           3  0  0  2  0  2  1  3.40  208/ 231  3.80  3.80  4.31  4.52  3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 3  0  0  1  1  1  2  3.80  178/ 218  3.36  3.39  4.18  4.25  3.80


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6 1 0 1 0 0 0  2.00 ****/  87 ****  ****  4.65  5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50   53/  79  4.50  4.50  4.64  4.75  4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 1 1 0  3.50   70/  75  3.50  3.50  4.57  4.25  3.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00   75/  79  3.00  3.00  4.45  3.95  3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00   37/  80  4.00  4.00  3.97  4.30  4.00


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  6 0 0 2 0 0 0  2.00   40/  41  2.00  2.00  4.50  2.00  2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  6 0 0 1 1 0 0  2.50   35/  38  2.50  2.50  4.19  2.50  2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       6  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   25/  38  4.50  4.50  4.62  4.50  4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   6  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   25/  39  4.00  4.00  4.27  4.00  4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00   21/  31  4.00  4.00  4.47  4.00  4.00

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    1       A    4       Required for Majors  0     Graduate      0      Major         7
  28-55      3      1.00-1.99    1       B    0
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99    2       C    3       General              0     Under-grad    8      Non-major     1
  84-150     1      3.00-3.49    3       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    0       F    0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                              responses to be significant
I    0              Other              6
?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 204  0103            University of Maryland                         Page  795
Title          INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C      Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    SU, HAIJUN                  Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    27
Questionnaires: 19               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  1  1  5  6  5  3.72 1458/1670  3.80 3.87 4.31 4.32 3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  2  7  4  5  3.53 1502/1666  3.75 3.79 4.27 4.27 3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  3  9  5  3.89 1136/1406  4.18 3.91 4.32 4.39 3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  2  3  7  6  3.79 1306/1615  3.89 3.89 4.24 4.29 3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3  6  2  3  4  1  2.50 1537/1566  2.58 3.39 4.07 4.00 2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2  1  7  7  2  3.32 1380/1528  3.60 3.79 4.12 4.11 3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  1  3  4  3  8  3.74 1370/1650  3.89 3.89 4.22 4.20 3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.78 4.67 4.64 5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 1 1  5  6  0  3.23 1498/1626  3.62 3.63 4.11 4.06 3.23


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  1  0  4  3 11  4.21 1185/1559  4.45 4.07 4.46 4.40 4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  2  5 12  4.53 1231/1560  4.59 4.38 4.72 4.73 4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  1  5  3  3  7  3.53 1384/1549  3.57 3.68 4.31 4.25 3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  4  1  4  5  5  3.32 1429/1546  3.69 3.57 4.32 4.30 3.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 3  2  1  5  7  3.61  985/1323  4.06 3.55 4.00 4.08 3.61


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0  3  0  2  5  5  3.60 1057/1384  3.43 3.36 4.10 4.07 3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0  3  1  5  2  3  3.07 1294/1378  3.39 3.57 4.29 4.25 3.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 3  1  2  2  4  3.25 1276/1378  3.28 3.52 4.31 4.26 3.25
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  5  2  0  1  3  2  3.38  768/ 904  3.46 3.38 4.03 4.01 3.38


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14 0  1  0  0  2  2  3.80  180/ 232  3.68 3.81 4.19 4.35 3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 1 1 2 1  0  2.60  235/ 239  3.34 3.64 4.21 4.33 2.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 1 0 1 1 2  0  3.25 ****/ 230  3.05 3.57 4.44 4.61 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14 0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  159/ 231  3.80 3.80 4.31 4.52 4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14 0  2  1  0  1  1  2.60  211/ 218  3.36 3.39 4.18 4.25 2.60

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type             Majors
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99   0      A   13      Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0      Major      18
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0      B    3                                Under-grad  19     Non-major   1
  56-83     6      2.00-2.99   1      C    0      General              0    Under-grad  19     Non-major   1
  84-150    3      3.00-3.49   3      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5      F    0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                               responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other               16
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 217  0102              University of Maryland                        Page  796
Title        ENGR THERMODYNAMICS              Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BENNETT, DAWN                    Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 12                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  1  6  4  0  1  2.50 1654/1670  2.09  3.87  4.31  4.32  2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  5  2  4  0  1  2.17 1654/1666  2.02  3.79  4.27  4.27  2.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  2  4  2  3  1  2.75 1388/1406  2.52  3.91  4.32  4.39  2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  6  1  1  2  0  2  3.17 1550/1615  2.53  3.89  4.24  4.29  3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  3  2  2  2  2  2.82 1522/1566  2.68  3.39  4.07  4.00  2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4  1  1  0  3  3  3.75 1152/1528  2.95  3.79  4.12  4.11  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  1  2  3  1  5  3.58 1436/1650  3.34  3.89  4.22  4.20  3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58 1097/1667  4.46  4.78  4.67  4.64  4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  7  2  2  1  0  1.75 1621/1626  1.56  3.63  4.11  4.06  1.75


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  3  2  4  3  0  2.58 1538/1559  1.97  4.07  4.46  4.40  2.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  6  2  3  1  2.92 1552/1560  2.80  4.38  4.72  4.73  2.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  8  0  4  0  0  1.67 1546/1549  1.58  3.68  4.31  4.25  1.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  1  7  1  2  1  0  1.73 1541/1546  1.62  3.57  4.32  4.30  1.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  4  0  4  1  0  2.22 1289/1323  2.06  3.55  4.00  4.08  2.22


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  6  0  2  3  0  2.18 1358/1384  2.16  3.36  4.10  4.07  2.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  1  0  3  5  2  3.64 1147/1378  2.94  3.57  4.29  4.25  3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  3  2  3  1  2  2.73 1335/1378  2.42  3.52  4.31  4.26  2.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   1  4  2  3  1  0  1  2.29  876/ 904  2.18  3.38  4.03  4.01  2.29


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 232  ****  3.81  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 239  ****  3.64  4.21  4.33  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 231  ****  3.80  4.31  4.52  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    11  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0       A    2      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major       8
 28-55     2       1.00-1.99    0       B    3
 56-83     5       2.00-2.99    1       C    5      General              0     Under-grad  12      Non-major   4
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49    2       D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3       F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                9
                                        ?    1
```

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  12   2   6   3   1  2.13 1662/1670  2.09  3.87  4.31  4.32  2.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  12   2   5   4   1  2.17 1654/1666  2.02  3.79  4.27  4.27  2.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   9   4   5   3   3  2.46 1395/1406  2.52  3.91  4.32  4.39  2.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   9   6   4   1   3   1  2.27 1607/1615  2.53  3.89  4.24  4.29  2.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  4   3   5   5   4   3  2.95 1495/1566  2.68  3.39  4.07  4.00  2.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12  4   6   1   0   1  2.00 1515/1528  2.95  3.79  4.12  4.11  2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   1   3   2   5  10   3  3.35 1519/1650  3.34  3.89  4.22  4.20  3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   1   0   0   0  12  11  4.48 1186/1667  4.46  4.78  4.67  4.64  4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 11  1   7   0   0  1.79 1620/1626  1.56  3.63  4.11  4.06  1.79


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  12   4   6   1   0  1.83 1555/1559  1.97  4.07  4.46  4.40  1.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0   6   4   4   6   3  2.83 1556/1560  2.80  4.38  4.72  4.73  2.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  12   5   4   1   0  1.73 1545/1549  1.58  3.68  4.31  4.25  1.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   1  11   4   6   0   0  1.76 1540/1546  1.62  3.57  4.32  4.30  1.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6  7   3   5   0   0  1.87 1307/1323  2.06  3.55  4.00  4.08  1.87


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0   9   1   4   3   0  2.06 1360/1384  2.16  3.36  4.10  4.07  2.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0   5   4   3   3   2  2.59 1342/1378  2.94  3.57  4.29  4.25  2.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  6   4   3   3   0  2.19 1357/1378  2.42  3.52  4.31  4.26  2.19
4. Were special techniques successful                 7   6   5   4   1   1   0  1.82  889/ 904  2.18  3.38  4.03  4.01  1.82
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1       0.00-0.99    0        A   6         Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0      Major       21
  28-55    0       1.00-1.99    0        B   5                                                         
  56-83    6       2.00-2.99    2        C   3         General              0      Under-grad  24      Non-major    3
  84-150   0       3.00-3.49    1        D   4
  Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    7        F   1         Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I   0         Other               20
                                         ?   2
```

```
Enrollment:     16
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean Mean Mean Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  8  4  1  1  0 1.64 1669/1670  2.09 3.87 4.31 4.32 1.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  7  4  3  0  0 1.71 1666/1666  2.02 3.79 4.27 4.27 1.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  4  4  3  3  0 2.36 1397/1406  2.52 3.91 4.32 4.39 2.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  8  3  0  2  1  0 2.17 1610/1615  2.53 3.89 4.24 4.29 2.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  5  1  3  1  1 2.27 1548/1566  2.68 3.39 4.07 4.00 2.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  5  2  0  4  1  2 3.11 1437/1528  2.95 3.79 4.12 4.11 3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  1  1  3  3  6  0 3.08 1571/1650  3.34 3.89 4.22 4.20 3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  1  0  0  0  9  4 4.31 1334/1667  4.46 4.78 4.67 4.64 4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0 11  2  0  0  0 1.15 1625/1626  1.56 3.63 4.11 4.06 1.15


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  7  7  0  0  0 1.50 1557/1559  1.97 4.07 4.46 4.40 1.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  1  6  4  3  0 2.64 1559/1560  2.80 4.38 4.72 4.73 2.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  9  5  0  0  0 1.36 1548/1549  1.58 3.68 4.31 4.25 1.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0 11  2  0  1  0 1.36 1544/1546  1.62 3.57 4.32 4.30 1.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  5  3  4  1  0 2.08 1294/1323  2.06 3.55 4.00 4.08 2.08


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  4  3  3  2  0 2.25 1356/1384  2.16 3.36 4.10 4.07 2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  2  3  5  2  0 2.58 1342/1378  2.94 3.57 4.29 4.25 2.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  2  6  3  0  1 2.33 1354/1378  2.42 3.52 4.31 4.26 2.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  5  2  1  3  1  0 2.43  873/ 904  2.18 3.38 4.03 4.01 2.43
```

```
                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0       A    1      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0       Major      14
28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0       B    5                                Under-grad   15      Non-major   1
56-83      1       2.00-2.99   7       C    6      General              0
84-150     4       3.00-3.49   0       D    1                                        
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   0       F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                15
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 221  0101                    University of Maryland                              Page  799
Title      DYNAMICS                                  Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   IRVINE, DAVID E                         Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   26
Questionnaires:  18                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   0   4   5   8  4.06 1189/1670  4.33 3.87  4.31 4.32  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   5   8   5  4.00 1199/1666  4.26 3.79  4.27 4.27  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   5   5   6  3.83 1169/1406  4.27 3.91  4.32 4.39  3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  11   0   0   1   4   2  4.14  990/1615  4.29 3.89  4.24 4.29  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   1   0   5   5   2  3.54 1268/1566  4.11 3.39  4.07 4.00  3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9  0   1   2   3   2  3.75 1152/1528  4.40 3.79  4.12 4.11  3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   2   4   6   6  3.89 1288/1650  4.31 3.89  4.22 4.20  3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   0   1  16  4.94  405/1667  4.96 4.78  4.67 4.64  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   0   5   9   2  3.81 1210/1626  3.97 3.63  4.11 4.06  3.81


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   1   5  12  4.61  755/1559  4.64 4.07  4.46 4.40  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1  17  4.94  358/1560  4.98 4.38  4.72 4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   3   5   9   0  3.22 1465/1549  3.55 3.68  4.31 4.25  3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   5   5   4   2  2.94 1486/1546  3.29 3.57  4.32 4.30  2.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1  2   1   5   4   4  3.44 1069/1323  3.89 3.55  4.00 4.08  3.44


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   1   2   3   4   4  3.57 1070/1384  3.54 3.36  4.10 4.07  3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   1   2   4   4   3  3.43 1221/1378  3.31 3.57  4.29 4.25  3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0   2   4   6   2  3.57 1172/1378  3.73 3.52  4.31 4.26  3.57
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  11   0   3   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 904  4.75 3.38  4.03 4.01  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0  0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 ****  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 ****  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0         0.00-0.99    0      A   4      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0      Major      16
28-55      1         1.00-1.99    0      B   7                                   
56-83      6         2.00-2.99    3      C   5      General               0      Under-grad  18      Non-major   2
84-150     0         3.00-3.49    2      D   0
Grad.      0         3.50-4.00    4      F   0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I   0      Other                17
                                         ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 221  0102          University of Maryland                        Page  800
Title       DYNAMICS                       Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   IRVINE, DAVID E               Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires:  14              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  6  7  4.43  780/1670  4.33  3.87  4.31  4.32  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  4  9  4.57  529/1666  4.26  3.79  4.27  4.27  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  6  8  4.57  525/1406  4.27  3.91  4.32  4.39  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   7  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  477/1615  4.29  3.89  4.24  4.29  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  480/1566  4.11  3.39  4.07  4.00  4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 7  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  260/1528  4.40  3.79  4.12  4.11  4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  4  8  4.43  690/1650  4.31  3.89  4.22  4.20  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  540/1667  4.96  4.78  4.67  4.64  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  7  4  4.25  728/1626  3.97  3.63  4.11  4.06  4.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  589/1559  4.64  4.07  4.46  4.40  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1560  4.98  4.38  4.72  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  1  4  7  2  3.71 1327/1549  3.55  3.68  4.31  4.25  3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  2  0  6  2  4  3.43 1404/1546  3.29  3.57  4.32  4.30  3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  0  2  6  5  4.23  560/1323  3.89  3.55  4.00  4.08  4.23


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  1  3  0  5  3  3.50 1103/1384  3.54  3.36  4.10  4.07  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  2  2  4  0  4  3.17 1282/1378  3.31  3.57  4.29  4.25  3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  1  0  4  2  4  3.73 1125/1378  3.73  3.52  4.31  4.26  3.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   7  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  146/ 904  4.75  3.38  4.03  4.01  4.75
```

```
                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                      Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0        A   3        Required for Majors   0        Graduate      0        Major        13
 28-55      1        1.00-1.99   0        B   4                                       Under-grad   14        Non-major     1
 56-83      5        2.00-2.99   2        C   4        General               0
 84-150     0        3.00-3.49   0        D   0                                       #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   4        F   0        Electives             0               responses to be significant
                                          P   0
                                          I   0        Other                12
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 221  0103            University of Maryland                        Page  801
Title      DYNAMICS                         Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  IRVINE, DAVID E                  Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   21
Questionnaires:  10                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                       Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  665/1670  4.33  3.87  4.31  4.32  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20 1037/1666  4.26  3.79  4.27  4.27  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40  715/1406  4.27  3.91  4.32  4.39  4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   4  0  1  1  0  4  4.17  972/1615  4.29  3.89  4.24  4.29  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  520/1566  4.11  3.39  4.07  4.00  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0  0  0  2  6  4.75  221/1528  4.40  3.79  4.12  4.11  4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  429/1650  4.31  3.89  4.22  4.20  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1667  4.96  4.78  4.67  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0  2  4  1  3.86 1172/1626  3.97  3.63  4.11  4.06  3.86


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  772/1559  4.64  4.07  4.46  4.40  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1560  4.98  4.38  4.72  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  1  0  3  3  3  3.70 1332/1549  3.55  3.68  4.31  4.25  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  2  1  3  3  3.50 1379/1546  3.29  3.57  4.32  4.30  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  3  3  3  4.00  692/1323  3.89  3.55  4.00  4.08  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0  2  0  0  5  2  3.56 1080/1384  3.54  3.36  4.10  4.07  3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0  1  0  5  1  2  3.33 1247/1378  3.31  3.57  4.29  4.25  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0  0  4  2  3  3.89 1061/1378  3.73  3.52  4.31  4.26  3.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   7  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 904  4.75  3.38  4.03  4.01  ****

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENME 301  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  802
Title        STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER         Baltimore County                                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ZUPAN, MARC                    Spring 2008                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     43
Questionnaires:  29                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    3   0  0  0  2  5  19  4.65  492/1670  4.65  3.87  4.31  4.24  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2   0  0  0  4 11  12  4.30  919/1666  4.30  3.79  4.27  4.18  4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  2  2  8  15  4.33  799/1406  4.33  3.91  4.32  4.22  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   6  0  0  2  7  12  4.48  592/1615  4.48  3.89  4.24  4.18  4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   6  0  2  6  8   5  3.76 1137/1566  3.76  3.39  4.07  4.04  3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 6  0  0  1  8  12  4.52  406/1528  4.52  3.79  4.12  4.07  4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  0  2  1  7  17  4.44  660/1650  4.44  3.89  4.22  4.12  4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  2  25  4.93  540/1667  4.93  4.78  4.67  4.67  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 1  0  0  1  3  15  4.74  223/1626  4.74  3.63  4.11  4.06  4.74


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  2  25  4.93  221/1559  4.93  4.07  4.46  4.40  4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0  27  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.38  4.72  4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  1  5  21  4.74  381/1549  4.74  3.68  4.31  4.25  4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0 11  16  4.59  607/1546  4.59  3.57  4.32  4.24  4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  2  0  1  0  3  20  4.75  183/1323  4.75  3.55  4.00  3.99  4.75


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 22  0  0  0  1  2   4  4.43 ****/1384  ****  3.36  4.10  4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0  0  0  1  3   4  4.38  751/1378  4.38  3.57  4.29  4.30  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0  1  0  1  2   3  3.86 ****/1378  ****  3.52  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   22  4  0  0  0  0   3  5.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.03  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   27  1  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  3.81  4.19  4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 1  0  0  0   1  3.00 ****/ 239  ****  3.64  4.21  3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  3.57  4.44  4.25  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27  1  0  0  0  1   0  4.00 ****/  87  ****  ****  4.65  4.30  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.50  4.64  4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 28  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.00  3.97  3.76  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  27  0  1  0  1  0   0  2.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.50  4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  27  0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  38  ****  2.50  4.19  3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        28  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  4.50  4.62  4.68  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  28  0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.00  4.47  4.51  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27  0  0  0  0  1   1  4.50 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     27  0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       27  0  0  0  0  0   2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  2.63  ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned           Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                   Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0      A    5      Required for Majors  0      Graduate     0       Major        20
  28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B   14                                  Under-grad  29       Non-major     9
  56-83      5      2.00-2.99    7      C    2      General              0      Under-grad  29       Non-major     9
  84-150     4      3.00-3.49    3      D    1
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
```

```
P    0                                      responses to be significant
I    0              Other              23
?    1
```

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

General

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	15	4	3.92	1318/1670	3.92	3.87	4.31	4.24	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	10	8	4.04	1173/1666	4.04	3.79	4.27	4.18	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	14	9	4.28	852/1406	4.28	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	7	10	2	3.65	1387/1615	3.65	3.89	4.24	4.18	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	6	7	4	1	2.64	1534/1566	2.64	3.39	4.07	4.04	2.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	7	4	2	3.40	1328/1528	3.40	3.79	4.12	4.07	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	3	8	9	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	3.89	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	842/1667	4.82	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	12	1	3.65	1318/1626	3.65	3.63	4.11	4.06	3.65

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	9	10	6	3.88	1360/1559	3.88	4.07	4.46	4.40	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	1163/1560	4.60	4.38	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	8	10	6	3.84	1265/1549	3.84	3.68	4.31	4.25	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	9	9	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	3.57	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	2	2	10	2	3.75	917/1323	3.75	3.55	4.00	3.99	3.75

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1080/1384	3.56	3.36	4.10	4.12	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	927/1378	4.11	3.57	4.29	4.30	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1061/1378	3.89	3.52	4.31	4.33	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.38	4.03	4.03	****

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	217/ 232	3.20	3.81	4.19	4.04	3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	111/ 239	4.40	3.64	4.21	3.99	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	3	4	3	0	3.00	226/ 230	3.00	3.57	4.44	4.25	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	159/ 231	4.00	3.80	4.31	4.11	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	5	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 218	****	3.39	4.18	3.93	****

Field Work

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	2.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	2.50	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.50	4.62	4.68	****

Self Paced

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENME 304  0101              University of Maryland                        Page  804
Title        MACHINE DESIGN                    Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MAJID, ABDUL                       Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     68
Questionnaires:  47                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    2  0 12  6 14 10  3  2.69 1648/1670  2.69 3.87  4.31 4.24  2.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     3  0  6 12 14  8  4  2.82 1635/1666  2.82 3.79  4.27 4.18  2.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    4  0  9  7  9 13  5  2.95 1358/1406  2.95 3.91  4.32 4.22  2.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     3  0  7  8  8 15  6  3.11 1559/1615  3.11 3.89  4.24 4.18  3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  1  9  6  8 14  6  3.05 1470/1566  3.05 3.39  4.07 4.04  3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 6  6  7 12  8  5  2.97 1455/1528  2.97 3.79  4.12 4.07  2.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             3  0  8  5 12 11  8  3.14 1563/1650  3.14 3.89  4.22 4.12  3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   4  1  0  0  0  6 36  4.86  768/1667  4.86 4.78  4.67 4.67  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 13  5 14  4  2  2.39 1602/1626  2.39 3.63  4.11 4.06  2.39


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         4  0  4  8 12 12  7  3.23 1501/1559  3.23 4.07  4.46 4.40  3.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    4  0  9 11  9  7  7  2.81 1556/1560  2.81 4.38  4.72 4.67  2.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0 10 11 12  8  2  2.56 1524/1549  2.56 3.68  4.31 4.25  2.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      4  0 22  8  5  6  2  2.02 1535/1546  2.02 3.57  4.32 4.24  2.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 29 9  2  1  0  1  1.62 1312/1323  1.62 3.55  4.00 3.99  1.62


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 42 0  4  1  0  0  0  1.20 ****/1384  **** 3.36  4.10 4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 41 0  3  2  0  1  0  1.83 ****/1378  **** 3.57  4.29 4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 41 0 3  2  0  1  0  1.83 ****/1378  **** 3.52  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   41 4  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/ 904  **** 3.38  4.03 4.03  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0       0.00-0.99    0      A   14         Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major       37
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B   19
  56-83      5       2.00-2.99    9      C    8         General               0    Under-grad  47      Non-major   10
  84-150    21       3.00-3.49   11      D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   13      F    0         Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                44
                                        ?    4
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 320  0101            University of Maryland                                Page  805
Title      FLUID MECHANICS                   Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  CARMI, SHLOMO                      Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   32
Questionnaires: 18                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  2  4  6  6  3.89 1358/1670  3.89 3.87  4.31 4.24  3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  7  6  5  3.89 1331/1666  3.89 3.79  4.27 4.18  3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  1  2  5  9  4.29  844/1406  4.29 3.91  4.32 4.22  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  12  1  0  1  4  0  3.33 1512/1615  3.33 3.89  4.24 4.18  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  1  1  4  6  3  3.60 1230/1566  3.60 3.39  4.07 4.04  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 11 1  0  3  1  2  3.43 1317/1528  3.43 3.79  4.12 4.07  3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  2  1  5  6  3  3.41 1498/1650  3.41 3.89  4.22 4.12  3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2 15  4.88  712/1667  4.88 4.78  4.67 4.67  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  1  7  8  0  3.44 1421/1626  3.44 3.63  4.11 4.06  3.44


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  1  6 10  4.39 1042/1559  4.39 4.07  4.46 4.40  4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  1  2  4 11  4.39 1340/1560  4.39 4.38  4.72 4.67  4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  5  8  3  3.76 1303/1549  3.76 3.68  4.31 4.25  3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  2  7  4  4  3.44 1398/1546  3.44 3.57  4.32 4.24  3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 11 2  0  2  2  1  3.00 1179/1323  3.00 3.55  4.00 3.99  3.00


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  2  1  1  3.75 ****/1384  **** 3.36  4.10 4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 2  0  1  1  0  2.25 ****/1378  **** 3.57  4.29 4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 1  1  1  1  0  2.50 ****/1378  **** 3.52  4.31 4.33  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 14   2  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 904  **** 3.38  4.03 4.03  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 232  **** 3.81  4.19 4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 239  **** 3.64  4.21 3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 230  **** 3.57  4.44 4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 231  **** 3.80  4.31 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 218  **** 3.39  4.18 3.93  ****


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  87  **** ****  4.65 4.30  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 4.50  4.64 4.53  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  75  **** 3.50  4.57 4.50  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  79  **** 3.00  4.45 3.68  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/  80  **** 4.00  3.97 3.76  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  41  **** 2.00  4.50 4.44  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  **** 2.50  4.19 3.96  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  **** 4.50  4.62 4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  39  **** 4.00  4.27 4.38  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  31  **** 4.00  4.47 4.51  ****


            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 3.33  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 2.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 ****  ****
```

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   0   0.00-0.99   0   A   4   Required for Majors 0   Graduate   0   Major   15
28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   6   Under-grad   18   Non-major   3
56-83   3   2.00-2.99   7   C   7   General   0
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
                                       P   0   responses to be significant
                                       I   0   Other   18
                                       ?   0

```
Course-Section: ENME 321  0101                University of Maryland                         Page  806
Title          TRANSFER PROCESSES                Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    MA, RONGHUI                         Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    93
Questionnaires: 58              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  2   0   0   4   9  29  14  3.95 1292/1670  3.95 3.87 4.31 4.24 3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   3   0   0   2   9  21  23  4.18 1048/1666  4.18 3.79 4.27 4.18 4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  2   0   1   1   6  23  25  4.25  876/1406  4.25 3.91 4.32 4.22 4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   2   3   2   1   9  29  12  3.91 1234/1615  3.91 3.89 4.24 4.18 3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 16  2   5  11  14   7  3.49 1297/1566  3.49 3.39 4.07 4.04 3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 9  2   4  10  15  15  3.80 1122/1528  3.80 3.79 4.12 4.07 3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           2   0   0   1   8  22  25  4.27  891/1650  4.27 3.89 4.22 4.12 4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                 3   0   0   1   0   3  51  4.89  693/1667  4.89 4.78 4.67 4.67 4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 1   3   9  22  10  3.82 1200/1626  3.82 3.63 4.11 4.06 3.82


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   3   2  14  37  4.52  883/1559  4.52 4.07 4.46 4.40 4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0   1   1   3  18  32  4.44 1302/1560  4.44 4.38 4.72 4.67 4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  2   1   4  27  21  4.16 1053/1549  4.16 3.68 4.31 4.25 4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0   4   3  11  17  20  3.84 1260/1546  3.84 3.57 4.32 4.24 3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 1   4  12  14  19  3.92  794/1323  3.92 3.55 4.00 3.99 3.92


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 54 0 1   0   2   1   0  2.75 ****/1384  **** 3.36 4.10 4.12 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 53 0 1   0   1   3   0  3.20 ****/1378  **** 3.57 4.29 4.30 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 53 0 1   0   2   1   1  3.20 ****/1378  **** 3.52 4.31 4.33 ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 53  3   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/ 904  **** 3.38 4.03 4.03 ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                   Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0        A   21        Required for Majors   0      Graduate    0        Major       53
28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0        B   23                                     Under-grad  58       Non-major    5
56-83      1        2.00-2.99    9        C    7        General               0
84-150    38        3.00-3.49   20        D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   13        F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                52
                                          ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101             University of Maryland                        Page  807
Title        SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB          Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   KHAN, AKHTAR   (Instr. A)       Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   19
Questionnaires: 18                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
          -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   5  4  2  5  2  2.72 1646/1670  2.70  3.87  4.31  4.24  2.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   8  4  3  3  0  2.06 1659/1666  2.08  3.79  4.27  4.18  2.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   2  5  5  3  3  3.00 1343/1406  2.65  3.91  4.32  4.22  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1   4  4  2  6  1  2.76 1598/1615  2.85  3.89  4.24  4.18  2.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8   7  2  0  1  0  1.50 1562/1566  1.69  3.39  4.07  4.04  1.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  4  2  3  5  4  3.17 1423/1528  3.20  3.79  4.12  4.07  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   8  5  3  2  0  1.94 1639/1650  1.82  3.89  4.22  4.12  1.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0  0  0  1 17  4.94  405/1667  4.97  4.78  4.67  4.67  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  6  4  2  4  0  2.25 1608/1626  1.86  3.63  4.11  4.06  1.98


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0   9  3  2  3  0  1.94 1552/1559  2.00  4.07  4.46  4.40  1.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   2  4  2  4  6  3.44 1530/1560  3.24  4.38  4.72  4.67  3.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 10  2  4  1  0  1.76 1544/1549  1.77  3.68  4.31  4.25  1.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0   9  4  2  2  0  1.82 1539/1546  1.76  3.57  4.32  4.24  1.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7  6  3  1  0  0  1.50 1313/1323  1.58  3.55  4.00  3.99  1.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0  4  0  1  0  0  1.40 1380/1384  1.40  3.36  4.10  4.12  1.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0  2  1  1  0  1  2.40 1354/1378  2.40  3.57  4.29  4.30  2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 3  0  1  1  0  2.00 1363/1378  2.00  3.52  4.31  4.33  2.00


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0   0   2  3  2  3  8  3.67  192/ 232  3.72  3.81  4.19  4.04  3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 4  1  5  4  4  3.17  227/ 239  3.08  3.64  4.21  3.99  3.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0  2  1  5  5  5  3.56  215/ 230  3.62  3.57  4.44  4.25  3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          1   0   2  1  1  5  8  3.94  166/ 231  3.86  3.80  4.31  4.11  3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0  0   7  1  3  5  2  2.67  208/ 218  2.60  3.39  4.18  3.93  2.67

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27       0      0.00-0.99    0        A    8        Required for Majors   0     Graduate       0      Major       15
  28-55       0      1.00-1.99    0        B    6                                                         
  56-83       1      2.00-2.99    2        C    3        General               0     Under-grad    18      Non-major    3
  84-150     12      3.00-3.49    5        D    0                                                         
  Grad.       0      3.50-4.00    7        F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0        Other                16
                                           ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101          University of Maryland                              Page  808
Title        SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB      Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  KHAN, AKHTAR   (Instr. B)   Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   19
Questionnaires:  18                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  5  4  2  5  2  2.72 1646/1670  2.70  3.87  4.31  4.24  2.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  8  4  3  3  0  2.06 1659/1666  2.08  3.79  4.27  4.18  2.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  2  5  5  3  3  3.00 1343/1406  2.65  3.91  4.32  4.22  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  1  4  4  2  6  1  2.76 1598/1615  2.85  3.89  4.24  4.18  2.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  8  7  2  0  1  0  1.50 1562/1566  1.69  3.39  4.07  4.04  1.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  4  2  3  5  4  3.17 1423/1528  3.20  3.79  4.12  4.07  3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  8  5  3  2  0  1.94 1639/1650  1.82  3.89  4.22  4.12  1.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  405/1667  4.97  4.78  4.67  4.67  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0  6  2  1  1  0  1.70 1622/1626  1.86  3.63  4.11  4.06  1.98


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       15  0  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 ****/1559  2.00  4.07  4.46  4.40  1.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  14  0  1  2  0  0  1  2.50 ****/1560  3.24  4.38  4.72  4.67  3.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14  0  3  0  0  1  0  1.75 ****/1549  1.77  3.68  4.31  4.25  1.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    14  0  2  1  1  0  0  1.75 ****/1546  1.76  3.57  4.32  4.24  1.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 14  2  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 ****/1323  1.58  3.55  4.00  3.99  1.50


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  4  0  1  0  0  1.40 1380/1384  1.40  3.36  4.10  4.12  1.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  2  1  1  0  1  2.40 1354/1378  2.40  3.57  4.29  4.30  2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13  0  3  0  1  1  0  2.00 1363/1378  2.00  3.52  4.31  4.33  2.00


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  0  0  2  3  2  3  8  3.67  192/ 232  3.72  3.81  4.19  4.04  3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0  0  4  1  5  4  4  3.17  227/ 239  3.08  3.64  4.21  3.99  3.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0  0  2  1  5  5  5  3.56  215/ 230  3.62  3.57  4.44  4.25  3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1  0  2  1  1  5  8  3.94  166/ 231  3.86  3.80  4.31  4.11  3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  0  0  7  1  3  5  2  2.67  208/ 218  2.60  3.39  4.18  3.93  2.67

                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0     A   8        Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0        Major       15
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0     B   6                                                           
  56-83      1        2.00-2.99    2     C   3        General               0      Under-grad  18        Non-major    3
  84-150    12        3.00-3.49    5     D   0                                                           
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    7     F   0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I   0        Other                16
                                        ?   0
```

```
                                                  Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean      Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  4  4  6  3  2  2.74 1645/1670  2.70  3.87  4.31  4.24  2.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  9  5  1  2  2  2.11 1657/1666  2.08  3.79  4.27  4.18  2.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  9  4  2  1  3  2.21 1402/1406  2.65  3.91  4.32  4.22  2.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  9  1  2  3  4  2.58 1602/1615  2.85  3.89  4.24  4.18  2.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  7  7  5  0  0  0  1.42 1565/1566  1.69  3.39  4.07  4.04  1.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  9  1  3  1  5  2.58 1505/1528  3.20  3.79  4.12  4.07  2.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0 11  3  4  0  1  1.79 1642/1650  1.82  3.89  4.22  4.12  1.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1667  4.97  4.78  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 10  2  3  2  1  2.00 1612/1626  1.86  3.63  4.11  4.06  2.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  5  6  4  0  2  2.29 1546/1559  2.00  4.07  4.46  4.40  2.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  3  2  2  4  5  3.38 1536/1560  3.24  4.38  4.72  4.67  3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  8  3  3  1  1  2.00 1534/1549  1.77  3.68  4.31  4.25  2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  7  3  4  1  1  2.13 1532/1546  1.76  3.57  4.32  4.24  2.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4  7  4  0  0  1  1.67 1311/1323  1.58  3.55  4.00  3.99  1.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0  1  1  1  0  0  2.00 ****/1384  1.40  3.36  4.10  4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 ****/1378  2.40  3.57  4.29  4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 1  0  1  1  0  2.67 ****/1378  2.00  3.52  4.31  4.33  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  16   2  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.03  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  9   0  1  2  3  2  2  3.20  217/ 232  3.72  3.81  4.19  4.04  3.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 9 0 2 1  3  3  1  3.00  230/ 239  3.08  3.64  4.21  3.99  3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0  1  1  1  4  3  3.70  211/ 230  3.62  3.57  4.44  4.25  3.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           9   0  2  3  0  4  1  2.90  225/ 231  3.86  3.80  4.31  4.11  2.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 9   0  4  2  1  2  1  2.40  213/ 218  2.60  3.39  4.18  3.93  2.40
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0       A   2       Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major       19
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0       B   8
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99    4       C   5       General               0    Under-grad  19      Non-major    0
 84-150    12        3.00-3.49    4       D   1
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    4       F   0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                16
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103                University of Maryland                        Page  810
Title        SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB            Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  KHAN, AKHTAR                      Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires:  10                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1   5   1   3   0  2.60 1652/1670  2.70  3.87  4.31  4.24  2.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  3   3   4   0   0  2.10 1657/1666  2.08  3.79  4.27  4.18  2.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  1   6   1   2   0  2.40 1396/1406  2.65  3.91  4.32  4.22  2.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0   3   2   4   1  3.30 1519/1615  2.85  3.89  4.24  4.18  3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   7  1   1   0   1   0  2.33 1546/1566  1.69  3.39  4.07  4.04  2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0   0   2   5   1  3.88 1063/1528  3.20  3.79  4.12  4.07  3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  6   2   2   0   0  1.60 1645/1650  1.82  3.89  4.22  4.12  1.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1667  4.97  4.78  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  6   3   1   0   0  1.50 1623/1626  1.86  3.63  4.11  4.06  1.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  4   4   0   1   0  1.78 1556/1559  2.00  4.07  4.46  4.40  1.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  1   2   3   3   0  2.89 1553/1560  3.24  4.38  4.72  4.67  2.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  5   3   1   0   0  1.56 1547/1549  1.77  3.68  4.31  4.25  1.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  8   0   0   1   0  1.33 1544/1546  1.76  3.57  4.32  4.24  1.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 7  1   1   0   0   0  1.50 ****/1323  1.58  3.55  4.00  3.99  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/1384  1.40  3.36  4.10  4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/1378  2.40  3.57  4.29  4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  1   0   1   0   0  2.00 ****/1378  2.00  3.52  4.31  4.33  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  7   0  0   0   0   2   1  4.33  102/ 232  3.72  3.81  4.19  4.04  4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0   1   1   1   0  3.00  230/ 239  3.08  3.64  4.21  3.99  3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0  0   0   1   2   0  3.67  212/ 230  3.62  3.57  4.44  4.25  3.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           7   0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67   86/ 231  3.86  3.80  4.31  4.11  4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   0  1   0   1   1   0  2.67  208/ 218  2.60  3.39  4.18  3.93  2.67
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0       0.00-0.99   0         A   4        Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0      Major        9
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0         B   3                                                        
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99   1         C   3        General               0    Under-grad   10      Non-major    1
 84-150    7       3.00-3.49   3         D   0                                                         
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   3         F   0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other                10
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 360  0101              University of Maryland                         Page  811
Title      VIBRATIONS                         Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   ZHU, WEIDONG                      Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    89
Questionnaires:  35                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                  Questions            NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0  0  1  5 16 12  4.15 1116/1670  4.15 3.87  4.31 4.24  4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  7 13 14  4.21 1027/1666  4.21 3.79  4.27 4.18  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  3  9 22  4.56  546/1406  4.56 3.91  4.32 4.22  4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   8  0  0  7  6 13  4.23  898/1615  4.23 3.89  4.24 4.18  4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  11  0  2  7  9  5  3.74 1159/1566  3.74 3.39  4.07 4.04  3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  4  1  1 11  6 11  3.83 1097/1528  3.83 3.79  4.12 4.07  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  2  6  9 17  4.21  962/1650  4.21 3.89  4.22 4.12  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   1  0  0  0  0 33  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.78  4.67 4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  1 10 17  4  3.75 1254/1626  3.75 3.63  4.11 4.06  3.75


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  2  9 22  4.61  772/1559  4.61 4.07  4.46 4.40  4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  1  1  7 24  4.64 1126/1560  4.64 4.38  4.72 4.67  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  5  8 13  6  3.63 1358/1549  3.63 3.68  4.31 4.25  3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   1  1  5  6  9 10  3.71 1313/1546  3.71 3.57  4.32 4.24  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 21  0  1  4  0  4  3.78  908/1323  3.78 3.55  4.00 3.99  3.78


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 32  0  1  1  1  0  0  2.00 ****/1384  **** 3.36  4.10 4.12  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 32  0  1  0  0  2  0  3.00 ****/1378  **** 3.57  4.29 4.30  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 32 0  0  2  0  1  0  2.67 ****/1378  **** 3.52  4.31 4.33  ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   34  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 232  **** 3.81  4.19 4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 34 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 239  **** 3.64  4.21 3.99  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            34  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231  **** 3.80  4.31 4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  34  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 218  **** 3.39  4.18 3.93  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0     0.00-0.99    0     A   15        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0    Major        30
  28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0     B   14                                  Under-grad   35    Non-major     5
  56-83      1     2.00-2.99    4     C    4        General              0
  84-150    24     3.00-3.49   14     D    0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00   11     F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other               31
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 412  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page  812
Title      MECH DESIGN:MANUF/PROD               Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    AROLA, DWAYNE D                  Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    33
Questionnaires: 28              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  3  6 18 4.56  611/1670  4.56 3.87  4.31 4.45  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4 15  8 4.15 1092/1666  4.15 3.79  4.27 4.35  4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   0  0  0  5  9 12 4.27  868/1406  4.27 3.91  4.32 4.48  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   6  1  0  3 11  6 4.00 1083/1615  4.00 3.89  4.24 4.37  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  6  0  4  3  6  7 3.80 1108/1566  3.80 3.39  4.07 4.17  3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 3 3 1 7 5  7 3.52 1265/1528  3.52 3.79  4.12 4.26  3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  2  3  7 14 4.27  891/1650  4.27 3.89  4.22 4.28  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3   0  0  0  1  0 24 4.92  540/1667  4.92 4.78  4.67 4.73  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 12 13 4.42  531/1626  4.42 3.63  4.11 4.28  4.42


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  0  0  1  1 23 4.88  307/1559  4.88 4.07  4.46 4.58  4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  1  2 22 4.84  751/1560  4.84 4.38  4.72 4.80  4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  5  6 14 4.36  864/1549  4.36 3.68  4.31 4.43  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  6  6 13 4.28  964/1546  4.28 3.57  4.32 4.43  4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0 0 3 6 13 4.45  374/1323  4.45 3.55  4.00 4.10  4.45


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26 0 0 0 1 1  0 3.50 ****/1384  **** 3.36  4.10 4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 26 0 0 0 0 1  1 4.50 ****/1378  **** 3.57  4.29 4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0 0 1 1 0  0 2.50 ****/1378  **** 3.52  4.31 4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  26   1  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/ 904  **** 3.38  4.03 4.22  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  24   0  0  0  0  4  0 4.00 ****/ 232  **** 3.81  4.19 4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 0 1 2  1 4.00 ****/ 239  **** 3.64  4.21 4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 1 0 0  3 4.25 ****/ 230  **** 3.57  4.44 4.30  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           24   0  0  0  1  2  1 4.00 ****/ 231  **** 3.80  4.31 4.24  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 24   0  0  0  1  1  2 4.25 ****/ 218  **** 3.39  4.18 4.09  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0       A    10      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major       26
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B    11                                   Under-grad   28      Non-major    2
  56-83      1       2.00-2.99    4       C     4      General              16      Under-grad   28      Non-major    2
  84-150    20       3.00-3.49   10       D     0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    9       F     0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P     0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I     0      Other                10
                                          ?     1
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 423  0101                University of Maryland                          Page  813
Title       HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN                 Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  FISHER, JESSE                        Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     49
Questionnaires:  26               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank     Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0  0  1  0  3  7 15  4.35  889/1670  4.35 3.87 4.31 4.45 4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  1  3  7 15  4.38  808/1666  4.38 3.79 4.27 4.35 4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  3  4 19  4.62  483/1406  4.62 3.91 4.32 4.48 4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  1  3  8 13  4.32  787/1615  4.32 3.89 4.24 4.37 4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  2  3  3  5  7  3.60 1230/1566  3.60 3.39 4.07 4.17 3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 1 5 5 10  4.14  805/1528  4.14 3.79 4.12 4.26 4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  1  1  4  4 16  4.27  891/1650  4.27 3.89 4.22 4.28 4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  2 15  9  4.27 1361/1667  4.27 4.78 4.67 4.73 4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 3 11 8  4.23  762/1626  4.23 3.63 4.11 4.28 4.23


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3  0  0  0  3  5 15  4.52  871/1559  4.52 4.07 4.46 4.58 4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3  0  0  0  1  8 14  4.57 1197/1560  4.57 4.38 4.72 4.80 4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 3 7 13  4.43  776/1549  4.43 3.68 4.31 4.43 4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0  0  0  3  2 18  4.65  532/1546  4.65 3.57 4.32 4.43 4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 2 0 2 5 5 9  4.00  692/1323  4.00 3.55 4.00 4.10 4.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 1 0 1 4  4.33 ****/1384  **** 3.36 4.10 4.32 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 0 3 3  4.50 ****/1378  **** 3.57 4.29 4.55 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 0 1 1 4  4.50 ****/1378  **** 3.52 4.31 4.60 ****
4. Were special techniques successful                 20  2  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 ****/ 904  **** 3.38 4.03 4.22 ****


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 232  **** 3.81 4.19 4.35 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/ 239  **** 3.64 4.21 4.26 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/ 230  **** 3.57 4.44 4.30 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          24  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 231  **** 3.80 4.31 4.24 ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 24 1 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  87  **** **** 4.65 4.80 ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 1 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 4.50 4.64 4.60 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 1 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  75  **** 3.50 4.57 4.56 ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   24  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 3.00 4.45 4.53 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               24  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  **** 4.00 3.97 3.67 ****

                                  Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type             Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99    1      A   12        Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0     Major       22
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0      B    6
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99    4      C    1        General               9    Under-grad   26    Non-major    4
  84-150    12       3.00-3.49    5      D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    5      F    1        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                11
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101                  University of Maryland                                    Page 814
Title          FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB                Baltimore County                                         AUG 6, 2008
Instructor:    ZHU, LIANG      (Instr. A)       Spring 2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 17                              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                     NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  6  9  4.41  794/1670  4.38  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  4 10  4.50  622/1666  4.57  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  2  7  7  4.31  823/1406  4.32  3.91  4.32  4.48  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  8  7  4.38  724/1615  4.44  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  4  0  0  1  6  5  4.33  559/1566  4.14  3.39  4.07  4.17  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0  0  0  2  7  6  4.27  697/1528  4.44  3.79  4.12  4.26  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  4 10  4.50  570/1650  4.36  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  472/1667  4.97  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0  0  1  3  7  4.55  371/1626  4.71  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.61


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  2  1 12  4.67  673/1559  4.74  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  2  1 12  4.67 1090/1560  4.79  4.38  4.72  4.80  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  4 10  4.60  562/1549  4.51  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  1  2 11  4.53  679/1546  4.29  3.57  4.32  4.43  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0  0  4  1  7  4.25  545/1323  3.71  3.55  4.00  4.10  4.25


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00 ****/1384  ****  3.36  4.10  4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/1378  ****  3.57  4.29  4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0  1  0  1  1  3.67 ****/1378  ****  3.52  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   1  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.22  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  14   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 232  4.80  3.81  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 239  4.70  3.64  4.21  4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0  0  2  1  4.33 ****/ 230  4.57  3.57  4.44  4.30  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 231  4.90  3.80  4.31  4.24  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 218  4.53  3.39  4.18  4.09  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.50  4.98  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  38  ****  2.50  4.19  4.36  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101          University of Maryland                          Page 815
Title      FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB             Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ZHU, LIANG    (Instr. B)    Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  18
Questionnaires:  17                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                           Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank   Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  2  6  9  4.41  794/1670  4.38 3.87  4.31 4.45  4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1   0  0  0  2  4 10  4.50  622/1666  4.57 3.79  4.27 4.35  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   0  0  0  2  7  7  4.31  823/1406  4.32 3.91  4.32 4.48  4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  8  7  4.38  724/1615  4.44 3.89  4.24 4.37  4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 4  0  0  1  6  5  4.33  559/1566  4.14 3.39  4.07 4.17  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 2 7 6 4.27 697/1528 4.44 3.79  4.12 4.26  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   0  0  0  2  4 10  4.50  570/1650  4.36 3.89  4.22 4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  472/1667  4.97 4.78  4.67 4.73  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 278/1626 4.71 3.63  4.11 4.28  4.61


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      15   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1559  4.74 4.07  4.46 4.58  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 15   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1560  4.79 4.38  4.72 4.80  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 15 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/1549  4.51 3.68  4.31 4.43  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   15   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1546  4.29 3.57  4.32 4.43  4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1323 3.71 3.55  4.00 4.10  4.25


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 3 0 4.00 ****/1384 **** 3.36  4.10 4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 ****/1378 **** 3.57  4.29 4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 ****/1378 **** 3.52  4.31 4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                14   1  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 904  **** 3.38  4.03 4.22  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 14 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 232 4.80 3.81  4.19 4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 239 4.70 3.64 4.21 4.26 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 230 4.57 3.57 4.44 4.30 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance         14   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 231  4.90 3.80  4.31 4.24  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 218 4.53 3.39  4.18 4.09  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  41 **** 2.00  4.50 4.98  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  38 **** 2.50  4.19 4.36  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    1      A   9     Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0     Major       13
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B   1
56-83      1        2.00-2.99    0      C   2     General               0     Under-grad   17     Non-major    4
84-150    11        3.00-3.49    4      D   0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    7      F   0     Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0     Other                14
                                        ?   1
```

```
Title      FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB                 Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ZHU, LIANG                         Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   20
Questionnaires:  7               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   0   5   2  4.29   964/1670  4.38  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57   529/1666  4.57  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   4   0   0   0   2   1  4.33   799/1406  4.32  3.91  4.32  4.48  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43   660/1615  4.44  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   3   0   1   0   2   1  3.75  1144/1566  4.14  3.39  4.07  4.17  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   0   3   4  4.57   368/1528  4.44  3.79  4.12  4.26  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43   690/1650  4.36  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1667  4.97  4.78  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83   151/1626  4.71  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.83

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   1   0   6  4.71   589/1559  4.74  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   725/1560  4.79  4.38  4.72  4.80  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   789/1549  4.51  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   3   0   4  4.14  1071/1546  4.29  3.57  4.32  4.43  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   2   0   2   1   1   1  3.20  1143/1323  3.71  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.20

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/1384  ****  3.36  4.10  4.32  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  4   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/ 232  4.80  3.81  4.19  4.35  5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  4   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/ 239  4.70  3.64  4.21  4.26  5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  4   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   152/ 230  4.57  3.57  4.44  4.30  4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          4   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/ 231  4.90  3.80  4.31  4.24  5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67    52/ 218  4.53  3.39  4.18  4.09  4.67
```

```
                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   4     Required for Majors  0     Graduate     0      Major       7
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B   2
56-83      0      2.00-2.99    1      C   0     General              0     Under-grad   7      Non-major   0
84-150     5      3.00-3.49    3      D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    1      F   0     Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P   0                               responses to be significant
                                      I   0     Other                5
                                      ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103            University of Maryland                              Page  817
Title      FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB              Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   ZHU, LIANG                  Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   18
Questionnaires:   7                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43   780/1670  4.38  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   355/1666  4.57  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   ****/1406  4.32  3.91  4.32  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  0  6  4.57   477/1615  4.44  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  6  1  0  0  0  0  1.00   ****/1566  4.14  3.39  4.07  4.17  ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 4  4.67   300/1528  4.44  3.79  4.12  4.26  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  3  2  4.00  1135/1650  4.36  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00      1/1667  4.97  4.78  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80   167/1626  4.71  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.80


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   387/1559  4.74  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   777/1560  4.79  4.38  4.72  4.80  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50   683/1549  4.51  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   1  0  0  0  4  1  4.20  1032/1546  4.29  3.57  4.32  4.43  4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 3 2 1  3.67   960/1323  3.71  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.67


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60    64/ 232  4.80  3.81  4.19  4.35  4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0 0 3 2  4.40   111/ 239  4.70  3.64  4.21  4.26  4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80    63/ 230  4.57  3.57  4.44  4.30  4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           2   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80    59/ 231  4.90  3.80  4.31  4.24  4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40    99/ 218  4.53  3.39  4.18  4.09  4.40


                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A    2       Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major        6
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B    3
56-83      0        2.00-2.99    2      C    0       General               0     Under-grad   7      Non-major    1
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 significant
                                       I    0       Other                 6
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 444  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  818
Title       MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI            Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  MYERS, OLIVER J                     Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   29
Questionnaires:  15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  6  4  3  3.47 1548/1670  3.14 3.87  4.31 4.45  3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  2  4  7  4.00 1199/1666  3.78 3.79  4.27 4.35  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  4  8  4.33  799/1406  4.10 3.91  4.32 4.48  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  3  6  5  4.14  990/1615  4.03 3.89  4.24 4.37  4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  1  2  2  2  3  3.40 1348/1566  3.34 3.39  4.07 4.17  3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1  0  5  4  4  3.71 1176/1528  3.51 3.79  4.12 4.26  3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  2  1  4  8  4.20  973/1650  4.23 3.89  4.22 4.28  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  768/1667  4.90 4.78  4.67 4.73  4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1  5  6  1  3.54 1372/1626  3.52 3.63  4.11 4.28  3.54


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  3  3  7  4.14 1230/1559  4.29 4.07  4.46 4.58  4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  2  2  2  8  4.14 1446/1560  4.29 4.38  4.72 4.80  4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  3  5  4  3.79 1294/1549  3.92 3.68  4.31 4.43  3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  3  1  3  5  2  3.14 1462/1546  3.23 3.57  4.32 4.43  3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 1  1  3  4  3  3.58 1000/1323  3.61 3.55  4.00 4.10  3.58


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  3  1  1  3  2  3.00 1260/1384  2.75 3.36  4.10 4.32  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  3  0  3  4  3.80 1092/1378  3.90 3.57  4.29 4.55  3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0  1  2  3  4  4.00  977/1378  4.00 3.52  4.31 4.60  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   5  1  1  0  1  1  3.00  820/ 904  3.63 3.38  4.03 4.22  3.00

                                  Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                  Type                    Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0      A   10        Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0        Major        13
  28-55      1       1.00-1.99   0      B    1
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99   1      C    0        General               0     Under-grad  15        Non-major     2
  84-150     8       3.00-3.49   1      D    0
  Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   7      F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                11
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 444  0102          University of Maryland                           Page  819
Title         MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI        Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MYERS, OLIVER J               Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   29
Questionnaires: 16              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions             NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   1   7   4   2   2  2.81 1639/1670  3.14  3.87  4.31  4.45  2.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   4   4   3   5  3.56 1490/1666  3.78  3.79  4.27  4.35  3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   2   5   2   7  3.88 1147/1406  4.10  3.91  4.32  4.48  3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   0   4   6   3  3.92 1203/1615  4.03  3.89  4.24  4.37  3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  9   1   0   3   2   1  3.29 1393/1566  3.34  3.39  4.07  4.17  3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  2   1   4   3   3  3.31 1386/1528  3.51  3.79  4.12  4.26  3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   2   5   8  4.25  903/1650  4.23  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1  15  4.94  472/1667  4.90  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0   1   7   4   2  3.50 1384/1626  3.52  3.63  4.11  4.28  3.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   5   9  4.44  984/1559  4.29  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   2   5   9  4.44 1302/1560  4.29  4.38  4.72  4.80  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   5   5   6  4.06 1120/1549  3.92  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   4   1   3   2   6  3.31 1429/1546  3.23  3.57  4.32  4.43  3.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  1   1   3   6   3  3.64  970/1323  3.61  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.64


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0   4   1   0   1   2  2.50 1333/1384  2.75  3.36  4.10  4.32  2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   0   0   2   3   2  4.00  970/1378  3.90  3.57  4.29  4.55  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0   1   2   0   4  4.00  977/1378  4.00  3.52  4.31  4.60  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   3   0   0   0   3   1  4.25  373/ 904  3.63  3.38  4.03  4.22  4.25


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0       A    9      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     0      Major       15
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    5
  56-83      0      2.00-2.99    3       C    1      General               0      Under-grad  16      Non-major    1
  84-150     7      3.00-3.49    5       D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                14
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 471  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  820
Title          COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI       Baltimore County                                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    CHARALAMBIDES,               Spring 2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    22
Questionnaires: 14                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  3  4  7  4.29  964/1670  4.42  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  3 10  4.57  529/1666  4.42  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  363/1406  4.63  3.91  4.32  4.48  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  2  2  9  4.36  750/1615  4.42  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  2  0  1  3  3  3.56 1257/1566  3.69  3.39  4.07  4.17  3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  2  0  3  8  4.07  859/1528  4.23  3.79  4.12  4.26  4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  246/1650  4.64  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  970/1667  4.58  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0  2  3  7  4.42  547/1626  4.35  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.42


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  0  4  8  4.46  946/1559  4.55  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.38  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  2  1  5  5  4.00 1146/1549  4.09  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  0  4  3  5  3.85 1256/1546  3.88  3.57  4.32  4.43  3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1  1  6  1  3  3.33 1099/1323  3.43  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.33


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0  2  0  0  1  3.00 ****/1384  4.17  3.36  4.10  4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1378  ****  3.57  4.29  4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1378  ****  3.52  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  12   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.22  ****


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   6   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   62/ 232  4.40  3.81  4.19  4.35  4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0  0  1  1  6  4.63   67/ 239  4.27  3.64  4.21  4.26  4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0  1  2  1  4  4.00  188/ 230  3.75  3.57  4.44  4.30  4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            6   0  1  0  1  3  3  3.88  175/ 231  3.52  3.80  4.31  4.24  3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6   1  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   44/ 218  4.36  3.39  4.18  4.09  4.71


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  87  ****  ****  4.65  4.80  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.50  4.64  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  3.50  4.57  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  3.00  4.45  4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                13   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.00  3.97  3.67  ****


             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.50  4.98  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  38  ****  2.50  4.19  4.36  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       12   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  4.50  4.62  4.58  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   12   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/  39  ****  4.00  4.27  4.02  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 12   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.00  4.47  4.49  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0 0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    12   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.80  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      12   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       12   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     12   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: ENME 471  0102              University of Maryland                        Page  821
Title       COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI          Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   CHARALAMBIDES,                Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 22                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   8  13  4.55  621/1670  4.42  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   4   5  12  4.27  943/1666  4.42  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   8  13  4.55  556/1406  4.63  3.91  4.32  4.48  4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   1   1   6  13  4.48  592/1615  4.42  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  16   0   1   1   2   2  3.83 1078/1566  3.69  3.39  4.07  4.17  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   1   2   6  12  4.38  580/1528  4.23  3.79  4.12  4.26  4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   6  14  4.50  570/1650  4.64  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0  12  10  4.45 1206/1667  4.58  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   1  13   7  4.29  693/1626  4.35  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.29


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   8  14  4.64  722/1559  4.55  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0  22  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.38  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   3  12   7  4.18 1036/1549  4.09  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   2   6   6   8  3.91 1232/1546  3.88  3.57  4.32  4.43  3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4   1   1   7   4   4  3.53 1030/1323  3.43  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.53


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16  0   0   1   1   0   4  4.17  740/1384  4.17  3.36  4.10  4.32  4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0   1   0   0   2   2  3.80 ****/1378  ****  3.57  4.29  4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0   1   1   0   0   3  3.60 ****/1378  ****  3.52  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  17   4   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.22  ****


                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10   0   1   0   1   4   6  4.17  129/ 232  4.40  3.81  4.19  4.35  4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0  0   1   3   4   4  3.92  171/ 239  4.27  3.64  4.21  4.26  3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0  1   2   4   0   5  3.50  217/ 230  3.75  3.57  4.44  4.30  3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10   0   2   1   4   3   2  3.17  221/ 231  3.52  3.80  4.31  4.24  3.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10   0   0   1   4   1   6  4.00  143/ 218  4.36  3.39  4.18  4.09  4.00

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A   14      Required for Majors  1    Graduate     3     Major      20
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    6
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    0      C    2      General             11    Under-grad  19     Non-major   2
 84-150    11      3.00-3.49    5      D    0
 Grad.      3      3.50-4.00    9      F    0      Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                               responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               10
                                       ?    0
```

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                 Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  3  1 10  4  3.83 1393/1670  3.43  3.87  4.31  4.45  3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  4 10  3  3.83 1363/1666  3.58  3.79  4.27  4.35  3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  3  8  5  3.89 1142/1406  3.47  3.91  4.32  4.48  3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  4  7  6  4.00 1083/1615  3.64  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10  2  2  2  2  0  2.50 1537/1566  2.84  3.39  4.07  4.17  2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  1  4  4  7  3.88 1055/1528  3.20  3.79  4.12  4.26  3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  3  2  6  6  3.72 1376/1650  3.75  3.89  4.22  4.28  3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  1  0  0  2 15  4.67 1022/1667  4.72  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  1  1  4  4  3  3.54 1372/1626  3.68  3.63  4.11  4.28  3.54


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  3  5  8  4.31 1112/1559  3.88  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  1  0  3  4  7  4.07 1463/1560  3.82  4.38  4.72  4.80  4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  1  2 11  1  3.80 1285/1549  3.64  3.68  4.31  4.43  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  1  2  4  5  3  3.47 1391/1546  3.49  3.57  4.32  4.43  3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1  0  0  6  6  2  3.71  936/1323  2.98  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.71


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/1384  4.60  3.36  4.10  4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00 ****/1378  3.20  3.57  4.29  4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/1378  3.40  3.52  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   2  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 904  3.50  3.38  4.03  4.22  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11   0  0  0  5  1  1  3.43  208/ 232  3.20  3.81  4.19  4.35  3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0  0  3  1  3  4.00  147/ 239  3.28  3.64  4.21  4.26  4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0 0  0  1  3  3  4.29  160/ 230  3.26  3.57  4.44  4.30  4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0  1  1  1  2  2  3.43  207/ 231  3.09  3.80  4.31  4.24  3.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0  0  0  3  2  2  3.86  172/ 218  3.06  3.39  4.18  4.09  3.86
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades      Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99    0      A   14     Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0     Major        16
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99    0      B    2
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99    0      C    0     General               0     Under-grad   18     Non-major     2
 84-150   13        3.00-3.49    5      D    0
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    9      F    0     Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                responses to be significant
                                        I    0     Other                15
                                        ?    0
```

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                Questions                      NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    1   0   0   2   3   6   4  3.80 1414/1670  3.43  3.87  4.31  4.45  3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   8   6  4.25  967/1666  3.58  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   2   5   6   2  3.53 1267/1406  3.47  3.91  4.32  4.48  3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   2   8   6  4.25  874/1615  3.64  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   5   2   3   1   1   4  3.18 1434/1566  2.84  3.39  4.07  4.17  3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1   0   0   3   5   6  4.21  742/1528  3.20  3.79  4.12  4.26  4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   1   2   6   7  4.19  985/1650  3.75  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81  842/1667  4.72  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0   0   0   2   8   2  4.00  953/1626  3.68  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   1   8   6  4.33 1092/1559  3.88  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   1   7   7  4.40 1326/1560  3.82  4.38  4.72  4.80  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   1  11   3  4.13 1078/1549  3.64  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   1   0   0   3   8   3  4.00 1139/1546  3.49  3.57  4.32  4.43  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   1   0   4   7   3  3.73  926/1323  2.98  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.73


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11  0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  372/1384  4.60  3.36  4.10  4.32  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11  0   0   1   3   0   1  3.20 1275/1378  3.20  3.57  4.29  4.55  3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0   0   1   2   1   1  3.40 1230/1378  3.40  3.52  4.31  4.60  3.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   11  1   0   1   1   1   1  3.50  718/ 904  3.50  3.38  4.03  4.22  3.50


                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   10  0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67   59/ 232  3.20  3.81  4.19  4.35  4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0  0   0   0   4   2  4.33  120/ 239  3.28  3.64  4.21  4.26  4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50  120/ 230  3.26  3.57  4.44  4.30  4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            10  0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  135/ 231  3.09  3.80  4.31  4.24  4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  10  0   0   1   1   2   2  3.83  174/ 218  3.06  3.39  4.18  4.09  3.83
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                     Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      2      0.00-0.99    0        A    9        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0        Major       9
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B    5                                                         
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    5        C    0        General              0    Under-grad   16        Non-major   7
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    1        D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3        F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other               13
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 482L 0104                University of Maryland                    Page  824
Title        CONTROLS/VIB LAB                   Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  TASCH, URI                          Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  3                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 1649/1670  3.43  3.87  4.31  4.45  2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 1639/1666  3.58  3.79  4.27  4.35  2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  2  0  0  1  3.00 1343/1406  3.47  3.91  4.32  4.48  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  0  0  1  2.67 1601/1615  3.64  3.89  4.24  4.37  2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   1  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1525/1528  3.20  3.79  4.12  4.26  1.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 1521/1650  3.75  3.89  4.22  4.28  3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 1022/1667  4.72  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1384/1626  3.68  3.63  4.11  4.28  3.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  2  0  0  1  3.00 1518/1559  3.88  4.07  4.46  4.58  3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 1546/1560  3.82  4.38  4.72  4.80  3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 1489/1549  3.64  3.68  4.31  4.43  3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  1  0  1  0  1  3.00 1473/1546  3.49  3.57  4.32  4.43  3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   1  1  1  0  0  0  1.50 1313/1323  2.98  3.55  4.00  4.10  1.50


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  1   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50  232/ 232  3.20  3.81  4.19  4.35  1.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50  238/ 239  3.28  3.64  4.21  4.26  1.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1   0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00  230/ 230  3.26  3.57  4.44  4.30  1.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           1   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50  231/ 231  3.09  3.80  4.31  4.24  1.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1   0  1  1  0  0  0  1.50  218/ 218  3.06  3.39  4.18  4.09  1.50


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

Title   SPECIAL PROBLEMS   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1670  5.00  3.87  4.31  4.45  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1666  5.00  3.79  4.27  4.35  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1615  5.00  3.89  4.24  4.37  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1566  5.00  3.39  4.07  4.17  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1528  5.00  3.79  4.12  4.26  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1650  5.00  3.89  4.22  4.28  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1667  5.00  4.78  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 953/1626  4.00  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1559  5.00  4.07  4.46  4.58  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1560  5.00  4.38  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1549  5.00  3.68  4.31  4.43  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1546  5.00  3.57  4.32  4.43  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00   1/1323  5.00  3.55  4.00  4.10  5.00
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A    0       Required for Majors   0    Graduate     0      Major      1
28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B    1                                                      
56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0        C    0       General               0    Under-grad   1      Non-major  0
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
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0       Other                 1
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 489G 0101            University of Maryland              Page  826
Title      BIOMATERIALS                     Baltimore County                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    TOPOLESKI, LEON                Spring 2008                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    39
Questionnaires: 29           Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3  0  0  0  0  4 22  4.85  262/1670  4.85 3.87  4.31 4.45  4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3  0  0  0  6  5 15  4.35  858/1666  4.35 3.79  4.27 4.35  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5  0  0  0  3  7 14  4.46  656/1406  4.46 3.91  4.32 4.48  4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3  2  0  0  4  5 15  4.46  619/1615  4.46 3.89  4.24 4.37  4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  1  1  1  3  7 13  4.20  706/1566  4.20 3.39  4.07 4.17  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1  0  0  2  6 17  4.60  346/1528  4.60 3.79  4.12 4.26  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3  0  0  0  4 12 10  4.23  926/1650  4.23 3.89  4.22 4.28  4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3  0  0  0  0  1 25  4.96  270/1667  4.96 4.78  4.67 4.73  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0  0  0  2  2 17  4.71  239/1626  4.71 3.63  4.11 4.28  4.71


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5  0  0  0  1  8 15  4.58  796/1559  4.58 4.07  4.46 4.58  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6  0  0  0  0  2 21  4.91  536/1560  4.91 4.38  4.72 4.80  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  8 16  4.67  488/1549  4.67 3.68  4.31 4.43  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5  0  0  0  0  5 19  4.79  357/1546  4.79 3.57  4.32 4.43  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 2  1  0  2  3 14  4.45  384/1323  4.45 3.55  4.00 4.10  4.45


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1384  **** 3.36  4.10 4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 27 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1378  **** 3.57  4.29 4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 27 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/1378  **** 3.52  4.31 4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  27  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 904  **** 3.38  4.03 4.22  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0       A   17       Required for Majors   0    Graduate     4      Major      24
  28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0       B    6
  56-83      1       2.00-2.99   1       C    1       General              11    Under-grad  25      Non-major   5
  84-150    11       3.00-3.49   5       D    0
  Grad.      4       3.50-4.00   6       F    0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                11
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 489H 0101                University of Maryland                         Page  827
Title        HEAT TRANS IN BIOL SYS              Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  ZHU, LIANG                          Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     8
Questionnaires:  7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  0  1  6 4.86  253/1670  4.86  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  2  5 4.71  355/1666  4.71  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  1  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  597/1406  4.50  3.91  4.32  4.48  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  2  4 4.43  660/1615  4.43  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  3  3 4.50  389/1566  4.50  3.39  4.07  4.17  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  157/1528  4.83  3.79  4.12  4.26  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  1  1  4 4.50  570/1650  4.50  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  861/1667  4.80  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0  0  0  0  2  4 4.67  278/1626  4.67  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  387/1559  4.83  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1  0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.38  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1  5 4.83  266/1549  4.83  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1  0  0  0  0  0  6 5.00    1/1546  5.00  3.57  4.32  4.43  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  0  1  4 4.80  156/1323  4.80  3.55  4.00  4.10  4.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  0  3 4.50  434/1384  4.50  3.36  4.10  4.32  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  0  2  1 4.33  797/1378  4.33  3.57  4.29  4.55  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  531/1378  4.67  3.52  4.31  4.60  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  4  2  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.22  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 232  ****  3.81  4.19  4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 239  ****  3.64  4.21  4.26  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 230  ****  3.57  4.44  4.30  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 231  ****  3.80  4.31  4.24  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  87  ****  ****  4.65  4.80  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.50  4.64  4.60  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/  75  ****  3.50  4.57  4.56  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/  79  ****  3.00  4.45  4.53  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 ****/  80  ****  4.00  3.97  3.67  ****
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENME 489P 0101            University of Maryland                         Page  828
Title       TPCS:ANALOG/DIGITAL ME         Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:     WAIKAR, SHAILES            Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     6
Questionnaires:  3                 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   902/1670  4.33  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   1   0   0   2  4.00  1199/1666  4.00  3.79  4.27  4.35  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   799/1406  4.33  3.91  4.32  4.48  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   775/1615  4.33  3.89  4.24  4.37  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   1   0   0   0   1  3.00  1478/1566  3.00  3.39  4.07  4.17  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  1   0   0   0   2  3.67  1202/1528  3.67  3.79  4.12  4.26  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1650  5.00  3.89  4.22  4.28  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   1   2  4.67  1022/1667  4.67  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0   0   1   1   1  4.00   953/1626  4.00  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  1092/1559  4.33  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00     1/1560  5.00  4.38  4.72  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   900/1549  4.33  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   1   0   0   0   2  3.67  1329/1546  3.67  3.57  4.32  4.43  3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   326/1323  4.50  3.55  4.00  4.10  4.50


                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENME 489S 0101            University of Maryland                           Page  829
Title      SPACE TECH & DESIGN            Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   MOGAVERO, MARC              Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   24
Questionnaires: 16                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
    ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  0  0  4  6  5  4.07 1183/1670  4.07  3.87  4.31  4.45  4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4  8  3  3.93 1282/1666  3.93  3.79  4.27  4.35  3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  3  3  6  3  3.60 1250/1406  3.60  3.91  4.32  4.48  3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  8  3  3  3.53 1439/1615  3.53  3.89  4.24  4.37  3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  1  5  3  3  3.46 1310/1566  3.46  3.39  4.07  4.17  3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 2 1 6 1 3  3.15 1426/1528  3.15  3.79  4.12  4.26  3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  0  5  4  5  4.00 1135/1650  4.00  3.89  4.22  4.28  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  540/1667  4.93  4.78  4.67  4.73  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 4 4 4  4.00  953/1626  4.00  3.63  4.11  4.28  4.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  3  3  8  4.36 1072/1559  4.36  4.07  4.46  4.58  4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  725/1560  4.86  4.38  4.72  4.80  4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  7  6  4.36  876/1549  4.36  3.68  4.31  4.43  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  5  4  4  3.92 1213/1546  3.92  3.57  4.32  4.43  3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 0 4 4 3  3.91  820/1323  3.91  3.55  4.00  4.10  3.91


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 2 0 0  3.00 ****/1384  ****  3.36  4.10  4.32  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 2 0 0  3.00 ****/1378  ****  3.57  4.29  4.55  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/1378  ****  3.52  4.31  4.60  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  14  1  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.22  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons              Type             Majors
    ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0      A   3       Required for Majors  0    Graduate    0     Major      9
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B   5
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    5      C   3       General              6    Under-grad  16    Non-major  7
  84-150     8        3.00-3.49    1      D   0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    2      F   0       Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I   0       Other                4
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENME 640  0101              University of Maryland                           Page  830
Title       FUND FLUID MECH I                 Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   EGGLETON, CHARL                   Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   13
Questionnaires:   9                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   0   4   5  4.56   611/1670  4.56  3.87  4.31  4.46  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   4   3  4.00  1199/1666  4.00  3.79  4.27  4.34  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   1   6   2  4.11   988/1406  4.11  3.91  4.32  4.36  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   775/1615  4.33  3.89  4.24  4.33  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   1   0   3   1  3.43  1335/1566  3.43  3.39  4.07  4.20  3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1  2   1   1   0   3  3.14  1429/1528  3.14  3.79  4.12  4.33  3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   1   1   4   2  3.56  1445/1650  3.56  3.89  4.22  4.30  3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00     1/1667  5.00  4.78  4.67  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1  0   0   2   4   1  3.86  1172/1626  3.86  3.63  4.11  4.20  3.86


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   5   4  4.44   971/1559  4.44  4.07  4.46  4.49  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   4   5  4.56  1205/1560  4.56  4.38  4.72  4.81  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   1   4   3  4.00  1146/1549  4.00  3.68  4.31  4.37  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   0   1   5   2  3.78  1285/1546  3.78  3.57  4.32  4.40  3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  1   0   1   4   3  3.89   834/1323  3.89  3.55  4.00  4.03  3.89


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50   434/1384  4.50  3.36  4.10  4.21  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   797/1378  4.33  3.57  4.29  4.42  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0   0   0   3   3  4.50   653/1378  4.50  3.52  4.31  4.51  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   328/ 904  4.33  3.38  4.03  4.04  4.33

                                   Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENME 677  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  831
Title      APPLIED ELASTICITY                 Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   NAZARI, AHMAD                   Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    10
Questionnaires:  9                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0  1  2  1  5  4.11 1150/1670  4.11  3.87  4.31  4.46  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0  1  2  2  4  4.00 1199/1666  4.00  3.79  4.27  4.34  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0  0  1  6  2  4.11  988/1406  4.11  3.91  4.32  4.36  4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3   0  0  0  4  2  4.33  775/1615  4.33  3.89  4.24  4.33  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5   0  0  1  1  2  4.25  643/1566  4.25  3.39  4.07  4.20  4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  1  0  1  4  4.33  631/1528  4.33  3.79  4.12  4.33  4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0  0  2  3  4  4.22  938/1650  4.22  3.89  4.22  4.30  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0  0  2  4  3  4.11 1465/1667  4.11  4.78  4.67  4.74  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  1  4  3  0  3.25 1491/1626  3.25  3.63  4.11  4.20  3.25


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0  1  2  2  4  4.00 1280/1559  4.00  4.07  4.46  4.49  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0  1  0  1  7  4.56 1205/1560  4.56  4.38  4.72  4.81  4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0  1  2  4  2  3.78 1299/1549  3.78  3.68  4.31  4.37  3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0  2  2  3  2  3.56 1366/1546  3.56  3.57  4.32  4.40  3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 8  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1323  ****  3.55  4.00  4.03  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0   0  1  2  1  1  3.40 1141/1384  3.40  3.36  4.10  4.21  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0   0  1  1  0  3  4.00  970/1378  4.00  3.57  4.29  4.42  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0  0  1  2  0  2  3.60 1165/1378  3.60  3.52  4.31  4.51  3.60
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   3   1  0  0  0  1  3.00 ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.04  ****


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  8   0   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  3.81  4.19  4.30  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  3.64  4.21  4.53  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  3.57  4.44  4.69  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  3.80  4.31  4.58  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  3.39  4.18  4.47  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  ****  4.65  4.61  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.50  4.64  4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  3.50  4.57  4.66  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  3.00  4.45  4.58  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.00  3.97  4.32  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  2.00  4.50  4.65  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  2.50  4.19  4.58  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  4.50  4.62  4.65  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  4.00  4.27  4.59  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  4.00  4.47  4.59  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.82  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.60  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.67  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.90  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   0   0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  5.00  ****
```

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 9   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENME 812P 0101            University of Maryland                              Page  832
Title      ANALOG AND DIGITAL ELE             Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   WAIKAR, SHAILES                    Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
Questionnaires:  5                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   300/1670  4.80  3.87  4.31  4.46  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  1037/1666  4.20  3.79  4.27  4.34  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  2  1  3.80  1186/1406  3.80  3.91  4.32  4.36  3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  0  2  2  4.50   552/1615  4.50  3.89  4.24  4.33  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00   851/1566  4.00  3.39  4.07  4.20  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  2  1  4.00   899/1528  4.00  3.79  4.12  4.33  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20   973/1650  4.20  3.89  4.22  4.30  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  1082/1667  4.60  4.78  4.67  4.74  4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25   728/1626  4.25  3.63  4.11  4.20  4.25


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  1022/1559  4.40  4.07  4.46  4.49  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1560  5.00  4.38  4.72  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   562/1549  4.60  3.68  4.31  4.37  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   345/1546  4.80  3.57  4.32  4.40  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  3  0  2  3.80   894/1323  3.80  3.55  4.00  4.03  3.80


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  1  0  0  1  3.50  1103/1384  3.50  3.36  4.10  4.21  3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   603/1378  4.50  3.57  4.29  4.42  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1378  5.00  3.52  4.31  4.51  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/ 904  ****  3.38  4.03  4.04  ****


                              Frequency Distribution

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