Course-Section: ENME 110 0101 University of Maryland Title STATICS SPENCE, ANNE M

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 790

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain	new insights, skills from thi	s course	0	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	964/1670	4.41	3.87	4.31	4.23	4.2
2. Did the instr	uctor make clear the expecte	d goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	991/1666	4.26	3.79	4.27	4.30	4.2
3. Did the exam	questions reflect the expect	ed goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	691/1406	4.52	3.91	4.32	4.31	4.4
4. Did other eva	luations reflect the expecte	d goals	0	3	1	1	1	8	7	4.06	1055/1615	4.13	3.89	4.24	4.17	4.0
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	4.3
6. Did written a	ssignments contribute to wha	t you learned	0	5	1	1	5	1	8		1063/1528		3.79	4.12	4.00	3.8
_	ng system clearly explained		0	0	0	2	8	3	8		1330/1650		3.89	4.22		3.8
-	s was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	17	3		1437/1667		4.78	4.67		
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	4.1
	Lecture															
1. Were the inst	ructor's lectures well prepa	red	0	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	933/1559	4.47	4.07	4.46	4.47	4.4
	uctor seem interested in the		0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	929/1560	4.75	4.38	4.72	4.68	4.7
	aterial presented and explai	-	0	0	1	1	4	4			1108/1549		3.68		4.32	4.1
	res contribute to what you l		1	1	1	0	3	1		4.42			3.57	4.32		
5. Did audiovisu	al techniques enhance your u	nderstanding	0	0	2	2	3	4	10	3.86	857/1323	3.89	3.55	4.00	3.91	3.8
	Discussion															
	cussions contribute to what		2	0	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	390/1384		3.36	4.10	3.92	4.5
	ents actively encouraged to		2	0	1	1	1	8	8	4.11			3.57	4.29	4.09	4.1
	uctor encourage fair and ope	n discussion	2	0 6	1	1	2	4	11				3.52	4.31	4.08	
4. Were special	e special techniques successful					0	0	4	8	4.38	300/ 904	3.51	3.38	4.03	3.94	4.3
	Field Work															
-	erience contribute to what y		20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	2.00	4.50	3.91	***
-	ly understand your evaluatio		20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 38		2.50	4.19	4.07	***
	uctor available for consulta		20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 38		4.50	4.62	4.63	***
	e could you discuss your eva		19	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39		4.00	4.27	4.42	***
5. Did conference	es help you carry out field	activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.47	4.28	***
	Self Paced															
	d system contribute to what		20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28		****	4.64	4.59	***
	stions make clear the expect		20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16		****	4.67	4.83	***
-	tacts with the instructor he	_	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27		****	4.54	4.46	***
	ack/tutoring by proctors hel	_	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 10		****	4.84	4.75	***
5. Were there en	ough proctors for all the st	udents	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	***
		Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Ex	pected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 6	0.00-0.99 0	 A 11		Pe	าแรก	 ed f	 or M	aior		0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 nr	12
28-55 4	1.00-1.99 0	В 7		100	4a11	ca I	OI M	۱۰۰ د م		0	Graduat		J	r.a.j.c	<i>-</i>	12
56-83	2.00-2.99 2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-c	rad 2	1	Non-	-major	9
84-150 0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0										-			5	-
Grad. 0						ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	gh
		P 0									respons					-
I 0				Ot1	her				1	.8	_		3			

Course-Section: ENME 110 0103 University of Maryland Title STATICS SPENCE, ANNE M

Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 26

Instructor:

Page 791 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	COLLEGA	Evaluation	Olipetion	naira

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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		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		1156/1378	4.05	3.52	4.31	4.08	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	12	0	1	4	2	0		812/ 904			4.03	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 232	****	3.81		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		****/ 230	****	3.57	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: ENME 110 0103 Title

STATICS

SPENCE, ANNE M Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 791 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: ENME 110 0104 University of Maryland Page 792 AUG 6, 2008 STATICS Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	35				
Questionnaires:	18	Student Co	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions

Title

		Genera	1																
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this cours	se	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	544/1670	4.41	3.87	4.31	4.23	4.61
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	s	0	0	0	1	1	11	5	4.11	1125/1666	4.26	3.79	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goal	ls	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	483/1406	4.52	3.91	4.32	4.31	4.61
		uations reflect				0	3	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	1000/1615	4.13	3.89	4.24	4.17	4.13
	_	eadings contrib		-		0	1	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	724/1566	4.13	3.39	4.07	4.03	4.18
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined		0	0	0	2	1	9	6	4.06	1107/1650	4.08	3.89	4.22	4.28	4.06
		was class cand				0	0	0	0	1	12	5	4.22	1388/1667	4.20	4.78	4.67	4.61	4.22
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effect:	iveness	2	1	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	921/1626	4.15	3.63	4.11	4.07	4.07
		Lectur	·e																
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	ct	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	777/1560	4.75	4.38	4.72	4.68	4.83
3. Was led	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained cle	early	1	0	1	1	2	7	6	3.94	1200/1549	4.03	3.68	4.31	4.32	3.94
4. Did the	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							1	1	1	6	9	4.17	1056/1546	4.20	3.57	4.32	4.32	4.17
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi							1	1	1	8	5	3.94	781/1323	3.89	3.55	4.00	3.91	3.94
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you lea	arned	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	257/1384	4.46	3.36	4.10	3.92	4.75
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to partic:	ipate	2	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	860/1378	3.94	3.57	4.29	4.09	4.25
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open disc	ussion	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	831/1378	4.05	3.52	4.31	4.08	4.31
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful			2	9	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.51	3.38	4.03	3.94	3.00
					Frequ	ency.	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Тур	e			Majors	5
00-27	 9	0.00-0.99	0	A	 9					 or M	 Iajor		0	 Graduate		0	Majo		14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	4		re(1u T (EU I	JI IV.	ajui	a	U	Graduate	-	U	Ma J C) <u>T</u>	7.4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3		Cor	nera:	1				1	Under-gr	-ad 1	.8	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0		Gel	ıcı d.	T				_	onder -gr	au 1	.0	MOII-	ilia JUL	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0		רק.	ectiv	700				0	#### - M	102ng +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	3	r P	0		ъΤ¢	=CLI\	ves				U	response				_	111
				I	0 Other						1	6	response	.b .c .	~ argi	ııııcaı	10		
				T	0		ULI	161				1	U						
				·	U														

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: SU, HAIJUN

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 22 Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 793 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	Course	Evaluation	Ougetion	naire
beaucife	COULDC	DValuacion	Queberon	.iaii c

	Frequencies					Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	2	7	3	Δ	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		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		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		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		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		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		1341/1626		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		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		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		3.38	4.03	4.01	3.40
i. Were special techniques successful	12	O		_	_	5	5	3.10	701/ 301	3.10	3.30	1.05	1.01	3.10
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
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102 Title

INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C

Instructor: SU, HAIJUN Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 794 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_		_	_	_		4400/4650					
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3		1139/1670		3.87		4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2		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		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		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		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		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		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		3.38	4.03		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	- ,					
	6 6	0	0		0	-			,	2.50	2.50	4.19	2.50	2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6 6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.50	25/ 38 25/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.62	4.50	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6 6	0	0	0	1	0	1		-,		4.00	4.27		4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	О	U	U	U	Т	U	Т	4.00	21/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.00	4.00

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. G			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	ı

 $\mbox{\mbox{$P$}} \mbox{\mbox{\mbox{$0$}}} \$

Course-Section: ENME 204 0103 University of Maryland
Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C Baltimore County

Instructor: SU, HAIJUN

Enrollment: 27
Ouestionnaires: 19

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 795

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Questions 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 0 0 1 2 7 4 5 3.53 1502/1666 3.75 3.79 4.27 4.27 3.53 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 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 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 2 5 5 3.60 1057/1384 3.43 3.36 4.10 4.07 3.60 5 2 3 3.07 1294/1378 3.39 3.57 4.29 4.25 3.07 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 1 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 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 Ω 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 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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-	_	•	
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENME 217 0102 ENGR THERMODYNAMICS Baltimore County Title

University of Maryland Page 796 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	BENNETT, DAWN	Spring 2008
Enrollment:	22	
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ranl	2	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I																
1 Did vo	nı dəin new	insights,ski	=	this course	0	0	1	6	4	0	1	2 50	1654/16	570	2.09	3.87	4.31	4.32	2.50
		or make clear			0	0	5	2	4	0	1		1654/16		2.02	3.79	4.27	4.27	2.17
		stions reflect	_	_	0	0	2	4	2	3	1		1388/14			3.91	4.32	4.39	2.75
		tions reflect			0	6	1	1	2	0	2		1550/16		2.53	3.89	4.24	4.29	3.17
				hat you learned	1	0	3	2	2	2	2		1522/15			3.39	4.07	4.00	2.82
				what you learned	0	4	1	1	0	3	3		1152/19			3.79	4.12	4.11	3.75
		system clearly			0	0	1	2	3	1			1436/16			3.89	4.22	4.20	3.58
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	5	7		1097/16			4.78	4.67	4.64	4.58
				ing effectiveness	0	0	7	2	2	1	0		1621/16			3.63	4.11	4.06	1.75
		Lecture	2																
1 Were t	he instruc	tor's lectures		repared	0	0	3	2	4	3	0	2 58	1538/19	559	1 97	4.07	4.46	4.40	2.58
		or seem inter	_	-	0	0	0	6	2	3	1		1552/15		2.80	4.38	4.72	4.73	2.92
				plained clearly	0	0	8	0	4	0	_		1546/15		1.58	3.68	4.31	4.25	1.67
		contribute to			0	1	7	1	2	1	-		1541/15			3.57	4.32	4.30	1.73
			_	our understanding	0	3	4	0	4	1	-		1289/13				4.00		2.22
		-	-	5															
		Discus																	
				hat you learned	1	0	6	0	2	3	0		1358/13			3.36	4.10	4.07	2.18
				l to participate	1	0	1	0	3	5	2		1147/13		2.94	3.57	4.29	4.25	3.64
		_		l open discussion	1	0	3	2	3	1			1335/13			3.52	4.31	4.26	2.73
4. Were s	special tec	hniques succes	ssful		1	4	2	3	1	0	1	2.29	876/ 9	904	2.18	3.38	4.03	4.01	2.29
		Laborat	cory																
1. Did th	ne lab incr	ease understar	-	the material	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 2	232	****	3.81	4.19	4.35	****
				round information	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 2	239	****	3.64	4.21	4.33	****
4. Did th	ne lab inst	ructor provide	e assist	ance	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 2	231	****	3.80	4.31	4.52	****
		Self I	Daced																
1. Did se	elf-paced s			hat you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	28	****	****	4.64	****	****
	_	ons make clear		_	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.67	****	****
		ts with the in		_	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	27	****	****	4.54	****	****
_		/tutoring by		_	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	10	****	****	4.84	****	****
		h proctors for		-	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	6	****	****	4.92	****	****
				Frequ	.ency	, Dist	ribu	ıtior	1										
				_	-									_					
Credits E	Carned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	oe 			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradu	uate	2	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 3															
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 5		Ger	neral	L				0	Under	r-gr	rad 1	2	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0			Means t			_	h
				P 0									respo	onse	es to b	e sign	ıfican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer					9							
				? 1															

Course-Section: ENME 217 0103 University of Maryland Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 797

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

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 2.1 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 2.1 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 2.4 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 2.2 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 2.9 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 2.0 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 3.3 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 4.4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 11 1 7 0 0 1.83 1555/1559 1.97 4.07 4.46 4.40 1.8				Fre	equer	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
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 2.1 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 2.1 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 2.4 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 2.2 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 2.9 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 2.0 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 3.3 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 4.4 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 11 1 7 0 0 0 1.79 1620/1626 1.56 3.63 4.11 4.06 1.7 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 1.8	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 2.1 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 2.4 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 2.2 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 2.9 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 2.0 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 3.3 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 4.4 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 1.7 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 1.8	General													,	
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 2.4 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 2.2 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 2.9 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 2.0 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 3.3 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 4.4 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 1.7 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 1.8	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
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 2.2 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 2.9 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 2.0 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 3.3 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 4.4 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 1.7 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 1.8	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
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 2.9 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 2.0 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 3.3 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 4.4 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 1.7 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 1.8	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
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 2.0 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 3.3 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 4.4 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 1.7 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 1.8	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
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 3.3 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 4.4 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 1.7 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 1.8	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
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 4.4 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 1.7 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 1.8	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
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 1.7 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 1.8	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
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 1.8	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
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 1.8	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
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 1.8	Lecture														
		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 2.8	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	6	4	4	6	3		,		4.38	4.72	4.73	2.83
	g ·		0				-								1.73
			1				0	0		,					1.76
•	-		6			5	0	0						4.08	1.87
Discussion															
		7	•	9	1	4	3	0						0,	2.06
	1 3 1						3	2		- ,					2.59
The state of the sign of the sign of the state of the sta					4	3	3	•							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 1.8	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	Freque	ency	Dis	trib	ution	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20	-			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENME 217 0104 University of Maryland ENGR THERMODYNAMICS

Baltimore County Spring 2008 Title BENNETT, DAWN Instructor:

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	15

Ctudont	Comman	Errolination	Ougstionnoins
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 798

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Questions							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
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 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.72 1.71 1.71		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 7 4 4 3 0 0 1.71 1666/1666 2.02 3.79 4.27 4.27 1.71 3.01 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4 4 3 3 0 0 2.36 1397/1406 2.52 3.89 4.22 4.32 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 4.39 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 4.39 2.31 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 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 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 0.15 0.15 0.15 0.15 0.15 0.15 0.15		Genera	 al															
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 0 9 4 4.31 1334/1667 4.46 4.78 4.67 4.61 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 1334/1378 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	1. Did you gain	new insights, ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	8	4	1	1	0	1.64	1669/1670	2.09	3.87	4.31	4.32	1.64
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 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 0 1.55 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 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 2.00 2.00 2.25 1356/1384 2.16 3.36 4.10 4.07 2.25 2.00 2.00 2.25 1356/1384 2.16 3.36 4.00 4.07 2.25 2.00 2.00 2.25 1356/1384 2.16 3.38 4.03 4.01 2.43 2.00 2.00 2.25 2.25 2.25 2.25 2.25 2.25	2. Did the instr	uctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	7	4	3	0	0	1.71	1666/1666	2.02	3.79	4.27	4.27	1.71
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 7.28 2.00 3.08 1571/1650 3.34 3.89 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 7.11 7.11 7.11 7.11 7.11 7.11 7	3. Did the exam	questions reflec	t the	expected goals	1	0	4	4	3	3	0	2.36	1397/1406	2.52	3.91	4.32	4.39	2.36
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 0 0 0 0 9 4 4.31 1334/1667 4.46 4.78 4.67 4.62 4.31 9. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 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 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 11 2 0 1 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 2.88 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 2 6 3 0 1 2.33 1354/1378 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	4. Did other eva	luations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	8	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1610/1615	2.53	3.89	4.24	4.29	2.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 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 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	5. Did assigned	readings contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	3	5		3	1	1	2.27	1548/1566	2.68	3.39	4.07	4.00	2.27
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 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 2.01 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	6. Did written a	ssignments contr	ibute t	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
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	7. Was the gradi	ng system clearl	y expla	ained	1	1	1	_	3	6	0	3.08	1571/1650	3.34	3.89	4.22	4.20	3.08
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8. How many time	s was class cand	elled		1	1	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1334/1667	4.46	4.78	4.67	4.64	4.31
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	9. How would you	grade the overa	ill tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	11	2	0	0	0	1.15	1625/1626	1.56	3.63	4.11	4.06	1.15
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		T.ectur	~_															
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	1 Were the inst		-	nrenared	1	Λ	7	7	Ω	Λ	Λ	1 50	1557/1559	1 97	4 07	4 46	4 40	1 50
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					1	-		6	-	3								
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				_		-	_	-		-								
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		_																
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				-						1	0							
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 2.58 2.58 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 5.40 5.40 5.40 5.40 5.40 5.40 5.40 5.40	J. DIG GGGIOVISC	ar ccciniiques en	manec j	your understanding	2	O	3	3	1	_	U	2.00	1201/1020	2.00	3.33	1.00	1.00	2.00
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		Discus	sion															
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	1. Did class dis	cussions contrib	oute 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
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	2. Were all stud	lents actively en	ıcourage	ed to participate	3	0				2	0	2.58	1342/1378	2.94	3.57	4.29	4.25	2.58
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	3. Did the instr	uctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	3	0			3	0	1	2.33	1354/1378	2.42	3.52	4.31	4.26	2.33
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	4. Were special	techniques succe	essful		3	5	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	873/ 904	2.18	3.38	4.03	4.01	2.43
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
				- 1														
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 14	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors		
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1				Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor:	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	14	
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5	28-55 2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: ENME 221 0101 University of Maryland Page 799 Baltimore County Spring 2008 Title DYNAMICS AUG 6, 2008 IRVINE, DAVID E Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment:	26	
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ou and don				373		_	ncies		-		tructor		Course	-		Level	Sect
		Question	5 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	: 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	1189/16	70	4.33	3.87	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	5	4.00	1199/16	66	4.26	3.79	4.27	4.27	4.00
		estions reflect			0	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1169/14	106	4.27	3.91	4.32	4.39	3.83
		ations reflect	_		0	11	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	990/16	515	4.29	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.14
		adings contrib			0	5	1	0	5	5	2		1268/15		4.11	3.39	4.07	4.00	3.54
				what you learned	1	9	0	1	2	3	2		1152/15		4.40	3.79	4.12	4.11	3.75
		g system clearly		ed	0	0	0	2	4	6			1288/16		4.31	3.89	4.22	4.20	3.89
		was class cance			0	1	0	0	0	1			405/16		4.96	4.78	4.67	4.64	4.94
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	II teachi	ng effectiveness	2	U	U	U	5	9	2	3.81	1210/16	26	3.97	3.63	4.11	4.06	3.81
		Lecture	e																
		ctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	,		4.64	4.07	4.46	4.40	4.61
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	17		,		4.98	4.38	4.72	4.73	4.94
		erial presente	_	_	0	0	1	3	5	9	0		1465/15		3.55	3.68	4.31	4.25	3.22
		es contribute to			0	0	2	5	5	4	2		1486/15		3.29	3.57	4.32	4.30	2.94
5. Did auc	diovisual	techniques en	nance you	r understanding	1	1	2	1	5	4	4	3.44	1069/13	323	3.89	3.55	4.00	4.08	3.44
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	4	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1070/13	884	3.54	3.36	4.10	4.07	3.57
		nts actively en			4	0	1	2	4	4	3	3.43	1221/13	378	3.31	3.57	4.29	4.25	3.43
				open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	6	2		1172/13		3.73	3.52	4.31	4.26	3.57
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		4	11	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 9	04	4.75	3.38	4.03	4.01	****
		Self 1	Paced																
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to wh	at you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	28	****	****	4.64	****	****
		ions make clea			17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/	16	****	****	4.67	****	****
_		acts with the in		_	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/	27	****	****	4.54	****	****
		k/tutoring by p		-	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	10	****	***	4.84	****	****
5. Were th	here enou	igh proctors fo	r all the	students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	6	****	****	4.92	***	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	ribu	ution	n										
				E-marked Corden				De						П	_			Mada:	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade			Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 				Тур	e 			Majors	; 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Gradu	ıate	<u>:</u>	0	Majo	r	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7															
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ger	neral	L				0	Under	-gr	ad 1	8	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El€	ectiv	ves				0			leans t			_	ın
				P 0		0/1					-	7	respo	nse	s to b	e sign	ıfican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	7							
				? 1															

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: ENME 221 0102 University of Maryland Page 800 Title DYNAMICS AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

								-	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	529/1666	4.26	3.79	4.27	4.27	4.57
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	525/1406	4.27	3.91	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	477/1615	4.29	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.57
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	690/1650	4.31	3.89	4.22	4.20	4.43
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	540/1667	4.96	4.78	4.67	4.64	4.93
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	728/1626	3.97	3.63	4.11	4.06	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1327/1549	3.55	3.68	4.31	4.25	3.71
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o 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 av	udiovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	560/1323	3.89	3.55	4.00	4.08	4.23
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude:	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	2	2	4	0	4	3.17	1282/1378	3.31	3.57	4.29	4.25	3.17
				d 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 s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		3	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	3.38	4.03	4.01	4.75
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
																		1.2
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	13
28-55 56-83	1 5	1.00-1.99	0 2	В 4 С 4		Cos	nera	1				0	IIndon ~	∞ad 1	.4	Non	ma iom	1
84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Gei	iera.	_				U	Under-g	ıau l	. "	MOI1-	-major	Т
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	Б 0		רם.	ecti	170C				0	#### -	Meane +	here -	re not	- enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	7	P 0		ET.	ECLI	v C S				U	respons				_	111
				P U							_	_	respons	co LU L	e prai	ııııdı	10	

Other

12

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: ENME 221 0103 University of Maryland Page 801 Title DYNAMICS AUG 6, 2008 IRVINE, DAVID E Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	21			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Course E	Evaluation (Questionnaire

	1					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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 learne	0 E	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 effectivenes	3 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		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		1379/1546		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		3.55	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	Λ	2	Λ	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		1247/1378		3.57	4.29	4.25	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	4	2	3		1061/1378		3.52	4.31	4.26	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 904		3.38	4.03	4.01	****
Post Property of the Control of the														
Fre	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	5			Rea	asons	3			Ту	ре			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 r	9
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 5														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101

STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER

Title Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC

Enrollment: 43 Questionnaires: 29

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 802 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	492/1670		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		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		3.89	4.24	4.18	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	2	6	8	5		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		3.79	4.12	4.07	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1		17		660/1650			4.22	4.12	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	540/1667			4.67		
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		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		3.55	4.00	3.99	4.75
1														
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		****/ 239	****	3.64	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 230		3.57			****
5. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	/ 250		3.37	1.11	1.25	
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		****/ 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	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	ıt i or	า									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	14						
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	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 23 ?

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101

TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT

Title

Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 803 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluatio:	n Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

			Fr	eque:	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mear
General	0	^	^	0	_	1 -	4	2 02	1210/1670	2 02	2 07	4 21	1 01	2 0
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6 7	15 10	4		1318/1670	3.92 4.04		4.31	4.24 4.18	3.9 4.0
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	2	14	9	4.04	1173/1666 852/1406		3.79 3.91	4.27	4.18	4.0
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		5	0	1	7	10	2		1387/1615			4.32	4.18	3.6
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0 1	2	4	6	7	4	1		1534/1566		3.89	4.24	4.16	2.6
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	2	7	4	2		1328/1528	3.40	3.79	4.12	4.04	3.4
-	2	0	0	3	3	8	9		1135/1650		3.79	4.12	4.12	4.0
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	18		842/1667	4.82	4.78	4.22	4.12	4.8
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	12			1318/1626		3.63	4.07		3.6
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	1	0	12	T	3.05	1310/1020	3.05	3.03	4.11	4.00	3.0
Lecture														
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	3.8
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	4.6
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	3.8
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	4.0
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	3.7
Discussion		_				_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	5	1		1080/1384		3.36	4.10	4.12	3.5
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	4.1
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	3	4	2		1061/1378	3.89	3.52	4.31	4.33	3.8
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	3.38	4.03	4.03	***
Laboratory														
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	3.2
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	4.4
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	3	4	3	0	3.00	226/ 230		3.57	4.44	4.25	3.0
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	4.0
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	5	0	1	0	3	0		****/ 218	****	3.39	4.18	3.93	**
Field Work														
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		****/ 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														
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		****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	***
Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Туј	рe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10		Pe	 anir	 ed f	 or №	 lajor		0	Graduat		0	 Majo	 r	18
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10		1/6/	quil	cu I	OT IV	١٠٠ تا ١٠٠	D	0	Graduati	_	J	ria JC	, <u></u>	Τ.

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24				
				2	Λ						

Baltimore County

Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 47

68

4. Were special techniques successful

Page 804 Course-Section: ENME 304 0101 University of Maryland AUG 6, 2008 Title MACHINE DESIGN Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Dept		t IMPG I1		
			Fr	eque		S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	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			4	1	0	0	0	1.20	****/1384	****	3.36	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			3	2	0	1	0		****/1378		3.57	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41 41	0	3	2	0	1			****/1378			4.31	4.33	****
5. 214 one important encourage fair and open arboards on			_	-	-	_	-		, 13,0					

Frequency Distribution

41 4 1 1 0 0 0 1.50 ****/ 904 **** 3.38 4.03 4.03 ****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	44				
				2	4						

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101 University of Maryland Title FLUID MECHANICS

Instructor: CARMI, SHLOMO

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 18

Page 805 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse l	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------	---------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	2	4	_	_	2 00	1250/1670	2 00	2 07	4 21	4 04	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4 7	6 6	6 5		1358/1670 1331/1666		3.87 3.79	4.31 4.27	4.24 4.18	3.89 3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0 1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	844/1406	4.29	3.79	4.27	4.10	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	1	4	0		1512/1615	3.33	3.89	4.32	4.22	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	4	6	3		1230/1566		3.39	4.07	4.18	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	3	1	2		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		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		712/1667		4.78	4.67		4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	8	0		1421/1626			4.11		3.44
Logtumo														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4 30	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		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		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		1398/1546		3.57	4.32	4.24	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	2	0	2	2	1		1179/1323					3.00
5. Did dadiovibadi teeliiiqaeb eliianee jour andelbeanding	Ü		-	J	2	_	_	3.00	11/0/1020	3.00	3.33	1.00	3.75	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	1	1		****/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		****/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		****	4.00	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00		****	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		****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

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

Questionnaires: 18

Instructor: CARMI, SHL Enrollment: 32 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 805 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101 University of Maryland Page 806 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MA, RONGHUI

Enrollment: 93 Questionnaires: 58

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								-	ncie	:S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk		m this course	2	0	0	4	9	29	14	3.95	1292/1670	3.95	3.87	4.31	4.24	3.95
_	_	ctor make clea			3	0	0	2	9	21	23		1048/1666		3.79	4.27	4.18	4.18
		uestions refle			2	0	1	1	6	23	25	4.25	876/1406	4.25	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.25
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflec	the ex	pected goals	2	3	2	1	9	29	12	3.91	1234/1615	3.91	3.89	4.24	4.18	3.91
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contril	oute 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 wr	ritten as:	signments cont	ribute t	o 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 th	ne grading	g system clear	ly expla	ined	2	0	0	1	8	22	25	4.27	891/1650	4.27	3.89	4.22	4.12	4.27
8. How ma	ny times	was class can	celled		3	0	0	1	0	3	51	4.89	693/1667	4.89	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How wo	uld you	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	13	0	1	3	9	22	10	3.82	1200/1626	3.82	3.63	4.11	4.06	3.82
		Lectu																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectur	prepared	2	0	0	3	2	14	37	4.52	883/1559	4.52	4.07	4.46	4.40	4.52	
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inte	rested i	n 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 le	cture mat	terial present	ed and e	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 th	ne lecture	es 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 au	diovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	5	3	1	4	12	14	19	3.92	794/1323	3.92	3.55	4.00	3.99	3.92
		Discu																
				what you learned	54	0	1	0	2	1	0		****/1384		3.36	4.10	4.12	****
				d to participate	53	0	1	0	1	3	0		****/1378		3.57	4.29	4.30	****
		_		d open discussion	53	0	1	0	2	1	1		****/1378		3.52	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succ	essful		53	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 904	****	3.38	4.03	4.03	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	1	Cum. GP		Expected Grades				Da		_			m				M	
credits E	arneu	Cuill. GP		Expected Grades					ason				Ту	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 21		Red	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	`s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	53
28-55	1	В 23																
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	9	C 7		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 5	8	Non-	major	5
84-150	38	3.00-3.49	20	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	t	
				I 0		Otl	her				5	52						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101 University of Maryl Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB Baltimore County Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. A) Spring 2008

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

16

Page 807 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	19				
Questionnaires:	18	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I ?

0

0

Quescion	laires.	10		Student Cot	LDC	ьvаı	uati	OII Q	iesc1	LOIIIIC	all C							
							Fr	equei	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	8	4	3	3	0	2.06	1659/1666	2.08	3.79	4.27	4.18	2.06
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t 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 ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	4	4	2	6	1	2.76	1598/1615	2.85	3.89	4.24	4.18	2.76
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute 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 w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	8	5	3	2	0	1.94	1639/1650	1.82	3.89	4.22	4.12	1.94
8. How ma	any times	was class cand		0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	405/1667	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.94	
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ching effectiveness	2	0	6	4	2	4	0	2.25	1608/1626	1.86	3.63	4.11	4.06	1.98	
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	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 le	ecture mat	terial presente	d 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 th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	7	6	3	1	0	0	1.50	1313/1323	1.58	3.55	4.00	3.99	1.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively en	.courage	ed 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	13	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1363/1378	2.00	3.52	4.31	4.33	2.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	nding o	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 y	you provid	ded with adequa	te bacl	ground information	0	0	4	1	5	4	4	3.17	227/ 239	3.08	3.64	4.21	3.99	3.17
3. Were r	necessary	materials avai	lable i	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 th	ne lab ins	structor provid	e assis	stance	1	0	2	1	1	5	8	3.94	166/ 231	3.86	3.80	4.31	4.11	3.94
5. Were 1	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	0	0	7	1	3	5	2	2.67	208/ 218	2.60	3.39	4.18	3.93	2.67
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits H	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8 B 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	15
28-55	0 1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6 C 3		a -	nera	1				0	TIN -3	~~d 1	.8	NT	ma	3
56-83		2.00-2.99	2 5	D 0		GE	mera	Т				U	Under-g	rau I	0	NON-	-major	3
84-150 Grad.	12 0	3.00-3.49	5 7	D 0 F 0		רים	ecti					0	#### - :	Moona +	homo -			-h
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	/	P 0		ъı	-ccll	ves				U	respons					111
				P 0			1				-	_	respons	es to L	e sign	'TTTCal	16	

Other

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101 University of Maryl
Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB Baltimore County
Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. B) Spring 2008
Enrollment: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 808

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

FILL OT THICHE.	13			
Questionnaires:	18	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Question	laires.	18		Student Cou	rse	Eval	uatio	on Qu	uesti	LOIII	aire	:						
								-	ncies				tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	8	4	3	3	0	2.06	1659/1666	2.08	3.79	4.27	4.18	2.06
		uestions reflec			0	0	2	5	5	3			1343/1406		3.91	4.32	4.22	3.00
		uations reflect			0	1	4	4	2	6			1598/1615					2.76
				what you learned	0	8	7	2	0	1			1562/1566		3.39	4.07		
				o what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	5			1423/1528		3.79	4.12	4.07	3.17
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	8	5	3	2			1639/1650		3.89	4.22		1.94
	-	was class canc		.b	0 8	0	0 6	0 2	0 1	1			405/1667		4.78	4.67		4.94
9. HOW WO	oula you	grade the overa	ching effectiveness	8	U	ь	2	Τ	Т	U	1.70	1622/1626	1.86	3.63	4.11	4.06	1.98	
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			15	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1559		4.07	4.46	4.40	1.94
		ctor seem inter			14	0	1	2	0	0	1		****/1560		4.38	4.72	4.67	3.44
				explained clearly	14	0	3	0	0	1			****/1549		3.68		4.25	
		es contribute t			14	0	2	1	1	0			****/1546				4.24	
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	14	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1323	1.58	3.55	4.00	3.99	1.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	13	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1363/1378	2.00	3.52	4.31	4.33	2.00
		Labora	torv															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understa	-	of the material	0	0	2	3	2	3	8	3.67	192/ 232	3.72	3.81	4.19	4.04	3.67
				ground information	0	0	4	1	5	4		3.17	227/ 239		3.64		3.99	3.17
				for lab activities	0	0	2	1	5	5		3.56				4.44		3.56
		structor provid			1	0	2	1	1	5	8	3.94	166/ 231	3.86	3.80	4.31	4.11	3.94
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	0	0	7	1	3	5	2	2.67	208/ 218	2.60	3.39	4.18	3.93	2.67
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
				_	_													
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83 84-150	1 12	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2 5	C 3 D 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	-major	3
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 7	D 0 F 0		E1	ectiv	7es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enouc	тh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	,	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v CD				J	respons					111
				I 0		O+1	her				1	.6	I CDPOIID		c bigi			
				1 0		001						. •						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB

Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 809

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		Question	.s		NR	NA	Fr	-	ncies 3	4	5	Ins [.] Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera							_	_	_		45454455					
		ew insights,ski			0	0	4 9	4 5	6	3	2		1645/1670	2.70	3.87			2.74
		ctor make clear uestions reflec		_	0	0	9	4	1 2	2 1	2		1657/1666 1402/1406		3.79 3.91	4.27	4.18 4.22	2.11
		uations reflect			0	0	9	1	2	3	ے 1		1602/1615		3.89	4.24	4.22	2.58
				what you learned	0	7	7	5	0	0	0		1565/1566		3.39	4.24	4.16	1.42
				to what you learned	0	0	9	1	3	1	5		1505/1500	3.20	3.79	4.12	4.04	2.58
		g system clearl		2	0	0	11	3	4	0	1		1642/1650	1.82		4.22	4.12	1.79
		was class canc		zinca	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1667			4.67	4.67	5.00
				ching effectiveness	1	0	10	2	3	2	1		1612/1626		3.63			2.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	prepared	2	0	5	6	4	0	2	2.29	1546/1559	2.00	4.07	4.46	4.40	2.29	
2. Did th	he instruc	ctor seem inter	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 le	ecture mat	terial presente	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 th	he lecture	es contribute t	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 au	udiovisual	l techniques en	your understanding	3	4	7	4	0	0	1	1.67	1311/1323	1.58	3.55	4.00	3.99	1.67	
		Discus																
				what you learned	16	0	1	1	1	0	0		****/1384		3.36	4.10	4.12	****
				ed to participate	16	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/1378	2.40	3.57	4.29	4.30	****
				nd open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/1378	2.00	3.52	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		16	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	3.38	4.03	4.03	****
		Labora	-				_			_			045/000					
			_	of the material	9	0	1	2	3	2		3.20	217/ 232		3.81	4.19	4.04	3.20
				ground information	9	0	2 1	1 1	3	3		3.00		3.08	3.64	4.21	3.99	3.00
				for lab activities	9	0	2	3	1	4			211/ 230		3.57		4.25	3.70
		structor provid nts for lab rep		stance learly specified	9 9	0	4	2	0 1	4 2	1	2.90	225/ 231 213/ 218	3.86 2.60	3.80 3.39	4.31 4.18	4.11 3.93	2.90
				Frequ	iencv	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Q		G 377		-									_				Mar 2 a.	
Credits I	≝arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				ке:	asons	; . – – –			Ту:	pe 			Majors 	; 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	19	
28-55	0 0	1.00-1.99	B 8 C 5		a -	20202	1				0	IIndox	d 1	0	Mon	mo i o	0	
56-83 84-150	12	2.00-2.99	4 4	C 5 D 1		Ge	nera	Т				U	Under-g	rad 1	. 7	non-	-major	U
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	4	F 0		רים	ecti	170C				0	#### - 1	Maana +	here -	re not	- enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	7	P 0		ъI	CULI	v CD				U	respons					111
				P 0			1				_	_	respons	es to D	E 2131	itttcar	.16	

Other

16

I

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103 University of Maryland Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 810

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	ı gain nev	v insights,ski	=	this course	0	0	1	5	1	3	0	2 60	1652/1670	2.70	3.87	4.31	4.24	2.60
		or make clear			0	0	3	3	4	0	0		1657/1666	2.08	3.79	4.27	4.18	2.10
		estions reflec			0	0	1	6	1	2	0		1396/1406	2.65	3.91	4.32	4.22	2.40
		ations reflect			0	0	0	3	2	4	1		1519/1615		3.89	4.24	4.18	3.30
			_	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 wri	itten assi	ignments contr	ibute 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	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	0	0	6	2	2	0	0	1.60	1645/1650	1.82	3.89	4.22	4.12	1.60
8. How mar	ny times v	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	4.97	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you gr	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	1.50	1623/1626	1.86	3.63	4.11	4.06	1.50
		Lectur	_															
1 Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lecture	_	renared	1	0	4	4	0	1	Ο	1 78	1556/1559	2.00	4.07	4.46	4.40	1.78
		or seem inter			1	0	1	2	3	3	0		1553/1560	3.24	4.38	4.72	4.67	2.89
				plained clearly	1	0	5	3	1	0	0		1547/1549	1.77	3.68	4.31	4.25	1.56
		s contribute t		1	0	8	0	0	1	0		1544/1546		3.57	4.32	4.24	1.33	
		our understanding	1	7	1	1	0	0	0		****/1323		3.55	4.00	3.99	****		
		_	_															
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/1384	1.40	3.36	4.10	4.12	****
				l to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/1378	2.40	3.57	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the	e instruct	cor encourage	tair and	d open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1378	2.00	3.52	4.31	4.33	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab incr	rease understa	nding 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 yo	ou provide	ed with adequa	te backs	round information	7	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	230/ 239	3.08	3.64	4.21	3.99	3.00
3. Were ne	ecessary n	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	212/ 230	3.62	3.57	4.44	4.25	3.67
		ructor provid			7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	86/ 231	3.86	3.80	4.31	4.11	4.67
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	208/ 218	2.60	3.39	4.18	3.93	2.67
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors		
00-27	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	9		
28-55																		
56-83	0	C 3		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	1		
84-150 Grad.	7 0	3.00-3.49	3 3	D 0 F 0		, וים	ectiv	a				0	#### - 1	Moana +	horo a	ro not	onomo	.h
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	3	P 0		ъ.т.	=CLI\	ves				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	ner				1	.0	respons	LB LU L	c bigi	ıııcaı		
				<u> </u>		001					_	-						

? 0

University of Maryland

Course-Section: ENME 360 0101 Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG Enrollment: 89

VIBRATIONS

Questionnaires: 35

Title

Page 811 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	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		1027/1666		3.79			4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	22	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		898/1615		3.89	4.24	4.18	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	2	7	9	5		1159/1566		3.39	4.07	4.04	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	11	6	11		1097/1528		3.79	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	9	17		962/1650		3.89	4.22	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	,	5.00		4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	10	17	4		1254/1626			4.11	4.06	
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			1126/1560			4.72	4.67	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	5	8	13	6		1358/1549		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
1, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,														
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	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utic	n									
Guardian Romanda Guardian Guardian				ъ.										

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed 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	В	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	5
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENME 412 0101 University of Maryland Title MECH DESIGN:MANUF/PROD Baltimore County

Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D

Enrollment: 33 Ouestionnaires: 28

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 812

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 3 6 18 4.56 611/1670 4.56 3.87 4.31 4.45 4.56 1 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 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 4.005. 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 0 4 0 4.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.81 4.19 4.35 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/ 239 **** 3.64 4.21 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 1 0 0 3 4.25 ****/ 230 **** 3.57 4.44 4.30 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 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 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ā	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-	•	-	
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENME 423 0101 University of Maryland HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN Baltimore County

Title

Instructor: FISHER, JESSE Enrollment: 49 Ouestionnaires: 26

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 813

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 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 1 5 5 10 4.14 805/1528 5 0 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 2.0 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 4.50 ****/1378 **** 3.57 4.29 4.55 **** 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 ****/1378 **** 3.52 4.31 4.60 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 4. Were special techniques successful 20 2 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 ****/ 904 **** 3.38 4.03 4.22 **** Laboratory 0 1 1 4.50 **** / 232 **** 3.81 4.19 4.35 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 24 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 **** / 239 **** 3.64 4.21 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 24 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 230 **** 3.57 4.44 4.30 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 24 0 0 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 **** 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 **** 3.50 4.57 4.56 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 3.00 4.45 4.53 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 24 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 Majors Reasons ______ A 12 00 - 271 0.00-0.99 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 в 6 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 4 C 1 General 9 Under-grad 26 Non-major D 0 84-150 3.00-3.49 5 12 F 1 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 3.50-4.00 5 Electives 0 P 0 responses to be significant

Other

11

I 0 Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101 University of Maryland

Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB Baltimore County
Instructor: ZHU, LIANG (Instr. A) Spring 2008

Enrollment: 18

Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 814

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 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 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 4.61Lecture 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 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 0 0 3 0 4.00 ****/1384 **** 3.36 4.10 4.32 **** 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 ****/1378 **** 3.57 4.29 4.55 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 1 0 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 **** 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 239 4.70 3.64 4.21 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 14 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 230 4.57 3.57 4.44 4.30 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 14 0 0 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 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons 0.00-0.99 1 A 9 00-27 0 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 84-150 11 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0 C 2 General 0 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 815

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 17
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

ZHU, LIANG

							Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	794/1670	4.38	3.87	4.31	4.45	4.41
_	_	w insights,ski tor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	622/1666		3.79	4.27	4.35	4.50
		estions reflec		_	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	823/1406		3.91	4.32	4.48	4.31
	_	ations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	724/1615		3.89	4.24	4.37	4.38
				what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	559/1566		3.39	4.07	4.17	4.33
	_	-		o what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	697/1528		3.79	4.12	4.26	4.27
		system clearl		_	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	570/1650		3.89	4.22	4.28	4.50
		was class cand			1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667			4.67	4.73	4.94
				hing effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	278/1626		3.63	4.11	4.28	4.61
1 Were t	he instru	Lectur ctor's lecture	nrenared	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/1559	4.74	4.07	4.46	4.58	4.67	
			15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1560		4.38	4.72	4.80	4.67		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	0	2		****/1549		3.68	4.31	4.43	4.60
		you learned	15 15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1546		3.57	4.32	4.43	4.53		
		our understanding	15	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1323		3.55	4.00	4.10	4.25		
3. 21a aa	a10115441	occinizates cir	our unacrodularing		Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	1.00	, 1323	3.71	3.33	1.00	1.10	1.25	
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.36	4.10	4.32	***
		_	_	ed to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	0		****/1378	****	3.57	4.29	4.55	***
		_		d open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/1378	****	3.52	4.31	4.60	***
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		14	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.38	4.03	4.22	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc			of the material	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 232	4.80	3.81	4.19	4.35	***
				ground information	14	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 239		3.64	4.21	4.26	***
_	_	_		or lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 230	4.57	3.57	4.44	4.30	***
	_	tructor provid			14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 231	4.90	3.80	4.31	4.24	***
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 218	4.53	3.39	4.18	4.09	****
1 Did fi	ald arman	Field		hat you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	2 00	4.50	4.98	****
				uation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 38		2.00	4.19	4.36	****
z. Dia yo	a cicarry	anaciscana yo	ui cvai	dacion criccita	10	U	_	O	Ü	U	U	1.00	, 30		2.50	1.10	1.50	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
				- 														
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		C.		1				0	IIndox	mad 1	7	More	ma i a	1
56-83 84-150	1 11	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	4	C 2 D 0		Gei	neral	L				U	Under-g	rau l	.7	NON-	major	4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	Б 0 F 0		בות	ectiv	700				0	#### -	Meand +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	J	3.30-4.00	,	P 0		11.1		, CD				J	respons				_	,
				I O		Otl	ner				1	4	TCDPOILD	-5 CO L	5191	cai	. •	
				2 1		001						-						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102 University of Maryl Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: ZHU, LIANG Spring 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

20

University of Maryland Page 816
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Cource	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect				
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	964/1670	4.38	3.87	4.31	4.45	4.29
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	4		529/1666		3.79	4.27	4.35	4.57
		estions reflec			0	4	0	0	0	2	1		799/1406		3.91	4.32	4.48	4.33
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	4	3		660/1615		3.89	4.24	4.37	4.43
				what you learned	0	3	0	1	0	2	1		1144/1566		3.39	4.07	4.17	3.75
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4		368/1528		3.79	4.12	4.26	4.57
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	0	0	4	3		690/1650		3.89	4.22	4.28	4.43
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1667		4.78	4.67	4.73	5.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	,		3.63		4.28	4.83
		Lectur																
1 Woro +1	ho inatri	Lectur ctor's lecture		nronarod	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	589/1559	4.74	4.07	4.46	4.58	4.71
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560		4.38	4.72	4.80	4.86
					0	0	0	0	1	2	4		789/1549		3.68	4.72	4.43	4.43
	Was lecture material presented and explained clea Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	3	0	_		1071/1546		3.57	4.32		4.14
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0 2	0	2	1	1			1143/1323			4.00		3.20
5. Did au	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						U	2	Τ.	1	1	3.20	1143/1323	3.71	3.33	4.00	4.10	3.20
		Discus																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.36	4.10	4.32	****
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understa	nding o	f 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 yo	ou provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 239	4.70	3.64	4.21	4.26	5.00
3. Were no	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or 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	e lab ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 231	4.90	3.80	4.31	4.24	5.00
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 218	4.53	3.39	4.18	4.09	4.67
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ation	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту:	pe 			Majors	:			
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	7
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	0
84-150																		
Grad.										#### - Means there are not enough								
	P 0						responses to be sign			e sign	ificar	ıt						
	I 0						Other 5											

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103 University of Maryland Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB Instructor: ZHU, LIANG

Enrollment:

18

Page 817 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Quescionnaires.	,	beauciie	COULDE	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

					Frequencies							Inct	ructor	Course	. Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
1 Did 1101	~~!~ ~	Genera ew insights,ski	-	m this source	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.43	780/1670	4.38	3.87	4.31	4.45	4.43
		ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	<i>5</i>	4.43	355/1666		3.79	4.27	4.45	4.43
		uestions reflec			1	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1406		3.79	4.32	4.48	****
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	477/1615		3.89	4.24	4.37	4.57
				what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	0		****/1566		3.39	4.07	4.17	****
				o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	300/1528		3.79	4.12	4.26	4.67
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	2	3	2		1135/1650		3.89	4.22	4.28	4.00
	_	was class cand		iiica	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667		4.78	4.67	4.73	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1626		3.63	4.11	4.28	4.80
J. How wo	ara you	grade elle overd	ii ccac	aring cricocryches	-	0	J	Ü	J	_	-	1.00	10771020	1.,1	3.03		1.20	1.00
		Lectur	_															
1. Were t			1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	387/1559		4.07	4.46	4.58	4.83		
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560		4.38	4.72	4.80	4.83
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	3	3	4.50	683/1549		3.68	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	960/1323	3.71	3.55	4.00	4.10	3.67
		Labora	tory															
1 Did th	e lah in	crease understa		of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 232	4.80	3.81	4.19	4.35	4.60
			_	ground information	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	111/ 239	4.70	3.64	4.21	4.26	4.40
				for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	63/ 230	4.57	3.57	4.44	4.30	4.80
	_	structor provid			2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 231	4.90	3.80	4.31	4.24	4.80
		_		early specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	99/ 218		3.39	4.18	4.09	4.40
J. Wele I	equil elle.	nes for tas rep	OICD CI	edity bpecified	-	0	J	Ü	_	_	3	1.10	<i>337</i> 210	1.55	3.33	1.10	1.05	1.10
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27									or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo	~~~~~	6
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 3					ке	quir	eu I	OT Mg	LJOES		U	Graduat	E	U	мајс	ıΤ	O
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 0					Co	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	7	Non	major	1
	84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Ge.	пета	т				U	onder-g	Lau	,	MOII-	ilia JUI	1
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0				Flectives				Ω	#### - Means there are not end		enous	rh						
grau.						Electives 0 #### - Means there are responses to be signif:					_	1++						
						-			es to L	e sigi	ıııcaı.	IL						
	I 0						Other 6					O						

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101 University of Maryland Page 818 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MYERS, OLIVER J

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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
 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		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		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
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		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		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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	-	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 444 0102 University of Maryland Page 819 AUG 6, 2008 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI Baltimore County Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

MYERS, OLIVER J Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 16

Ctudont	Comman	Errolination	Ougstionnoins
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies						_					- 1	a .	
		Ouestion	S		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
		Genera	_															
_	-	ew insights,ski			0	0	1	7	4	2	2		1639/1670			4.31		2.81
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	4	4	3	5		1490/1666		3.79	4.27	4.35	3.56
	_	uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	5	2	7		1147/1406		3.91	4.32	4.48	3.88
		uations reflect		1 3	0	3	0	0	4	6	3		1203/1615			4.24		3.92
				what you learned	0	9	1	0	3	2			1393/1566			4.07	4.17	3.29
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	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 t	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	903/1650	4.23	3.89	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How m	nany times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	472/1667	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.73	4.94
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching 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	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	2	5	9	4.44	984/1559	4.29	4.07	4.46	4.58	4.44
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 1	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	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 t	he lecture	es contribute t	o 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 a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	2	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	970/1323	3.61	3.55	4.00	4.10	3.64
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	970/1378	3.90	3.57	4.29	4.55	4.00
				nd open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	977/1378	4.00	3.52	4.31	4.60	4.00
		echniques succe		•	9	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	373/ 904	3.63	3.38	4.03	4.22	4.25
Fr						7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
	_																	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 9						Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			-			_						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0													3 -	
Cand		3.60 3.15	2	E 0		ъ1.	Elogtirog		0 ####		пппп	Maana +	homo o	not	- 020110	-h		

Credits E	arned 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	В	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	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	14	_				
				2	Λ							

Course-Section: ENME 471 0101

Title COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI

Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 820 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionn	aire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	------

Questions		NA	Fre	equen 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	_	0	2	4	-	4 00	064/1670	4 40	2 07	4 21	4 45	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0 1	3 0	4	7 10	4.29	964/1670	4.42	3.87	4.31 4.27	4.45	4.29 4.57
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.57	529/1666 363/1406	4.42	3.79 3.91	4.27	4.35	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.71	750/1615	4.42	3.89	4.24	4.40	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	1	3	3		1257/1566	3.69	3.39	4.24	4.17	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	-	4.07	859/1528	4.23	3.79	4.12	4.17	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0			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		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		4.42	547/1626		3.63			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		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		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		****/1384	4.17	3.36	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1378	****	3.57	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1378	****	3.52	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	Ι	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		4.00	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		****/ 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		****/ 75	****	3.50	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 38	****	2.50	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	4.50	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 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	0.00	****/ 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	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 471 0101 University of Maryland
Title COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI Baltimore County

Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 14

Spring 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 820

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	3	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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,

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain 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.
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.
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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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.
. 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
Lecture														
. 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
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
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
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
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
Discussion														
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
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1378	****	3.57	4.29	4.55	4
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/1378	****	3.52	4.31	4.60	2
Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.38	4.03	4.22	,
Laboratory														
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
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
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
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
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
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	.s			Ty	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB Instructor: TASCH, URI

University of Maryland Page 822 Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	10	4	2 02	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		1363/1666	3.58	3.79	4.31	4.45	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	5		1142/1406	3.47	3.79	4.32	4.48	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	6		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		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		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		1376/1650	3.75	3.79	4.12	4.28	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	15		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		1372/1626	3.68	3.63	4.11	4.28	3.54
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	_	_	-1	4	3	3.34	13/2/1020	3.00	3.03	4.11	4.20	3.34
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		****/1384		3.36	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/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		****/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
Frequ	ıency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 14		Por				 ajor		0	Graduat		0	 Majo		16
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2		ved	4urre	EU I	J⊈ IM	ajui	D	U	Graduati	=	U	Ma JO	т.	10
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	major	2
84-150 13 3.00-3.49 5 D 0														
Grad. $0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0$		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

15

responses to be significant

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

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Title Instructor: TASCH, URI

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Page 823 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

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 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 2 8 2 4.00 953/1626 3.68 3.63 4.11 4.28 4.00					equer			_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
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 4.21 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 2 8 2 4.00 953/1626 3.68 3.63 4.11 4.28 4.00	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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 2 8 2 4.00 953/1626 3.68 3.63 4.11 4.28 4.00	General														
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	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
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	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
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	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
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	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
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	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
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	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
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	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
7.0.0	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
hecture	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		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		1	0	0	0	1	7	7						4.80	
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	g and a second and	1	0	0	0	1	11	3							
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		1	1	0	0	3	8	3					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	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	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		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				0	1	3	0	1		- ,					
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			0	0	1	2	1	1							
4. Were special techniques successful 11 1 0 1 1 1 3.50 718/904 3.50 3.38 4.03 4.22 3.50	-	11	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	3.38	4.03	4.22	3.50
Laboratory	Laboratowy														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 59/232 3.20 3.81 4.19 4.35 4.67		1 0	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	1	1 67	EQ / 222	2 20	2 01	1 10	1 25	1 67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 4 2 4.33 120/239 3.28 3.64 4.21 4.26 4.33	<u> </u>		-	-	-	-	<u>ک</u> ۸	2							
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							3	2		- ,					
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	-				-	1	2	3		- ,					
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10 0 0 1 1 2 3 4.33 133/231 3.09 3.80 4.31 4.24 4.33	-		-		1	1	2	2		,					
3. Here requirements for tab reports creatify appearance in the first of the results of the resu	J. Here requirements for tax reports creatly specified	-0	3	5	_	_	2		3.03	1,1, 210	3.00	3.37	1.10	1.00	3.03

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0104 Baltimore County CONTROLS/VIB LAB TASCH, URI

?

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

9

Questions

University of Maryland Page 824 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

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

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

		Genera	_															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	1	1	0	0	1		1649/1670	3.43		4.31	4.45	2.67
		ctor make clear	_	_	0	0	1	1	0	0	1		1639/1666	3.58	3.79	4.27	4.35	2.67
	_	uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	0	0	1		1343/1406	3.47		4.32	4.48	3.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1601/1615	3.64	3.89	4.24	4.37	2.67
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute 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	e grading	g system clearl	y explai:	ned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1521/1650	3.75	3.89	4.22	4.28	3.33
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.72	4.78	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1384/1626	3.68	3.63	4.11	4.28	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1518/1559	3.88	4.07	4.46	4.58	3.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested 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 led	cture mat	terial presente	d and ex	plained 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	e lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.49	3.57	4.32	4.43	3.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1313/1323	2.98	3.55	4.00	4.10	1.50
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	e lab ind	crease understa	nding of	the material	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	232/ 232	3.20	3.81	4.19	4.35	1.50
				round information	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	238/ 239	3.28	3.64	4.21	4.26	1.50
_	_	_	_	r 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	e lab ins	structor provid	e assist	ance	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	231/ 231	3.09	3.80	4.31	4.24	1.50
		nts for lab rep			1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	218/ 218	3.06	3.39	4.18	4.09	1.50
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	s 			Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajors	3	0	Graduate	·	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad	3	Non-	major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					3	_					

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENME 488 2101 Page 825 Title SPECIAL PROBLEMS AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG Enrollment: 1 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00.27 0 0.00.00 0 7 0									Craduat					1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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 t	here	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to b	e sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: ENME 489G 0101

39

BIOMATERIALS

TOPOLESKI, LEON

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Page 826 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

						Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																	
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,skil	="	this course		3	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	262/1670	4.85	3.87	4.31	4.45	4.85
		ctor make clear				3	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	858/1666	4.35	3.79	4.27	4.35	4.35
		estions reflect				5	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	656/1406		3.91	4.32	4.48	4.46
	_	ations reflect		-		3	2	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	619/1615		3.89	4.24	4.37	4.46
		eadings contribu	_	_	ed	3	1	1	1	3	7	13	4.20	706/1566		3.39	4.07	4.17	4.20
	_	signments contri		-		3	1	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	346/1528		3.79	4.12	4.26	4.60
		system clearly		-		3	0	0	0	4	12	10	4.23	926/1650		3.89	4.22	4.28	4.23
		was class cance	_			3	0	0	0	0	1		4.96	270/1667		4.78	4.67	4.73	4.96
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effective	ness	8	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	239/1626	4.71	3.63	4.11	4.28	4.71
	Lecture																		
1. Were t	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	8	15	4.58	796/1559	4.58	4.07	4.46	4.58	4.58
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	536/1560	4.91	4.38	4.72	4.80	4.91
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	488/1549	4.67	3.68	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned		5	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	357/1546	4.79	3.57	4.32	4.43	4.79
5. Did av	udiovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	ur understand	ling	7	2	1	0	2	3	14	4.45	384/1323	4.45	3.55	4.00	4.10	4.45
		Discuss																	
		ussions contribu				27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.36	4.10	4.32	****
		nts actively end				27	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1378	****	3.57	4.29	4.55	****
		ctor encourage f		open discuss	ion	27	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1378	****	3.52	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful			27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.38	4.03	4.22	****
					_														
					Freque	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	ades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17			Pec	quire		 ът М	 aior		0	Graduat		4	Majo		24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6			1000	1411	.u 10) I 1·1	ajoi	5	O	Graduat	_	-	Maje) <u> </u>	21
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1			Ger	neral				1	.1	Under-g	rad 2	:5	Non-	-major	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			001		-			_	_	011001 9.		-	2.011		-
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Electives							1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-		•	P 0		210001702								respons				_	•
				I 0		Other						1	.1	-					
				? 1															

Course-Section: ENME 489H 0101 University of Maryland HEAT TRANS IN BIOL SYS Title

Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 827

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ZHU, LIANG Enrollment: 8 Ouestionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 253/1670 4.86 3.87 4.31 4.45 4.86 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 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 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 597/1406 4.50 3.91 4.32 4.48 4.50 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 4.83 3.79 4.12 4.26 4.83 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 157/1528 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 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 $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 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 Ω Ω Ω 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 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 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 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1546 5.00 3.57 4.32 4.43 5.00 1 0 0 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 3 4.50 434/1384 4.50 3.36 4.10 4.32 4.50 1 0 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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 232 **** 3.81 4.19 4.35 **** 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 239 **** 3.64 4.21 4.26 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 230 **** 3.57 4.44 4.30 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 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 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.50 4.64 4.60 **** 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned **** 3.50 4.57 4.56 **** 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 75 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 Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General		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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489P 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 TPCS:ANALOG/DIGITAL ME

Page 828

Title Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Cours	Evaluation	Questionnaire

C 0

0

0

0

D 0

F

Ρ 0

I

?

56-83

84-150

Grad.

0

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49 0

3.50-4.00 1

0

		Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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
Freq	uency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				D.O.	ason	~			т.	20			Majora	
credits mained cum. GPA Expected Grades					asull 	> 			Ту	 be			Majors 	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1	Required for Majors						s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1														

General

Other

Electives

2

0

1

Under-grad 3 Non-major 1

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENME 489S 0101 Title SPACE TECH & DESIGN Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC Spring 2008

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 829

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	-			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	ew insights,ski		om 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	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected 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	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	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 oth	ner evalı	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	1	8	3	3	3.53	1439/1615	3.53	3.89	4.24	4.37	3.53
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	3	0	2	1	6	1	3		1426/1528		3.79	4.12	4.26	3.15
		g system clearl		ined	2	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	3.89	4.22	4.28	4.00
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	1	13		540/1667		4.78	4.67	4.73	
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.63	4.11	4.28	4.00
		Lectur		_				_	_			4050/4550						
1. Were th			2	0	0	0	3	3	8		1072/1559		4.07	4.46	4.58	4.36		
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject . Was lecture material presented and explained clear?							0	0	2	12		725/1560		4.38	4.72	4.80	4.86
		_			2	0	0	0	1	1		4.36	,		3.68	4.31	4.43	4.36
		es contribute t		-	3 4	0	0	0	5	4			1213/1546		3.57	4.32	4.43	
5. Did auc	ilovisua.	i tecnniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	1	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	820/1323	3.91	3.55	4.00	4.10	3.91
		Discus	gion															
1 Did als	acc dica			what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	Λ	Ο	3 00	****/1384	****	3.36	4.10	4.32	****
				ed to participate	14	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/1378		3.57	4.29	4.55	****
				nd open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/1378		3.52	4.31	4.60	****
		echniques succe		a open arboablen	14	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 904		3.38	4.03	4.22	****
		1																
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3		Rec	nuire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		1.00			10		-	-	or addac.	-	-		_	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 3	General 6						6	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	7	
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

0

0

I ? University of Maryland Page 830
Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

~· .			A
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: ENME 640 0101

13

FUND FLUID MECH I

EGGLETON, CHARL

Title

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

0

1

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

							1				Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om 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	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected 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 qu	estions reflec	t the e	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 othe	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	775/1615	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did assi	igned re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1335/1566	3.43	3.39	4.07	4.20	3.43
6. Did writ	ten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o 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 clearl	y expla	ined	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 canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How woul	 How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened 							0	2	4	1	3.86	1172/1626	3.86	3.63	4.11	4.20	3.86
	Lecture																	
1. Were the	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	5	4	4.44	971/1559	4.44	4.07	4.46	4.49	4.44
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n 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 lect	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	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	lecture	s contribute t	o 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 audi	lovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	834/1323	3.89	3.55	4.00	4.03	3.89
		Discus	sion															
1. Did clas	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute 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	l studen	ts actively en	courage	ed 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	instruc	tor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 spe	4. Were special techniques successful						0	0	1	2	3	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	3.38	4.03	4.04	4.33
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 3 B 2		Required for Majors 1							Graduat	е	3	Majo	r	8
20-33	J	1.00-1.99	U	ے ط														

General

Other

Electives

0

5

Under-grad

6

responses to be significant

- Means there are not enough

Non-major 1

С

D

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

1

Course-Section: ENME 677 0101

Title APPLIED ELASTICITY

Instructor: NAZARI, AHMAD Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 831 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect 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		1199/1666	4.11	3.79	4.31	4.40	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	_	4.11	988/1406	4.11	3.75	4.32	4.36	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4		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		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		4.33		4.33	3.79	4.12	4.33	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3		4.22		4.22	3.89	4.22	4.30	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	4			1465/1667			4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	3			1491/1626					3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	4		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		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			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			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		1141/1384		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			1165/1378	3.60		4.31	4.51	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	Τ	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		****/ 230	****	3.57	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 75	****	3.50	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8 8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79 ****/ 80	****	3.00	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	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		****/ 41	****	2.00	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	2.50	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.50	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****

Course-Section: ENME 677 0101
Title APPLIED ELASTIC

APPLIED ELASTICITY NAZARI, AHMAD

Instructor: NAZZ Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008 Page 831 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to 1	be sig	gnificant	
				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 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

WAIKAR, SHAILES Instructor:

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		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		1103/1384		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		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 Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	d 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	В	2						
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	1						