

Course-Section: ENME 110 02
 Title Statics
 Instructor: Irvine,David E
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 690
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	463/1447	4.48	3.90	4.31	4.18	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	590/1447	4.44	3.82	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	675/1241	4.54	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	827/1402	4.30	3.81	4.24	4.15	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	563/1358	4.01	3.54	4.11	4.03	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	476/1316	4.27	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	513/1427	4.54	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	668/1434	4.28	3.62	4.10	4.10	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	839/1387	4.38	4.07	4.46	4.46	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.83	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	962/1386	4.00	3.72	4.32	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	626/1380	4.02	3.63	4.32	4.31	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	536/1193	4.04	3.46	4.02	3.99	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	261/1172	3.71	3.55	4.15	3.95	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	839/1182	3.93	3.87	4.35	4.18	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	559/1170	3.94	3.80	4.38	4.17	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	335/ 800	3.63	3.41	4.06	3.95	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	12	
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	1				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ENME 110 02
 Title Statics
 Instructor: Khan,Akhtar
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 691
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	507/1447	4.48	3.90	4.31	4.18	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	648/1447	4.44	3.82	4.27	4.30	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	323/1241	4.54	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.30	3.81	4.24	4.15	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	608/1358	4.01	3.54	4.11	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	4.27	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	373/1427	4.54	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.28	3.62	4.10	4.10	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	490/1387	4.38	4.07	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	855/1386	4.00	3.72	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	582/1380	4.02	3.63	4.32	4.31	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	243/1193	4.04	3.46	4.02	3.99	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1042/1172	3.71	3.55	4.15	3.95	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	856/1182	3.93	3.87	4.35	4.18	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1013/1170	3.94	3.80	4.38	4.17	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	562/ 800	3.63	3.41	4.06	3.95	3.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	585/1447	4.48	3.90	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	217/1447	4.44	3.82	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	634/1241	4.54	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	715/1402	4.30	3.81	4.24	4.15	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1057/1358	4.01	3.54	4.11	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	950/1316	4.27	3.78	4.14	3.99	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	172/1427	4.54	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	634/1434	4.28	3.62	4.10	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	798/1387	4.38	4.07	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	656/1387	4.83	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	911/1386	4.00	3.72	4.32	4.32	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1030/1380	4.02	3.63	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	759/1193	4.04	3.46	4.02	3.99	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	2	3	1	2.73	1143/1172	3.71	3.55	4.15	3.95	2.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	941/1182	3.93	3.87	4.35	4.18	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	798/1170	3.94	3.80	4.38	4.17	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	691/ 800	3.63	3.41	4.06	3.95	3.38
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 110 04
 Title Statics
 Instructor: Irvine,David E
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 693
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	899/1447	4.48	3.90	4.31	4.18	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	983/1447	4.44	3.82	4.27	4.30	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	611/1241	4.54	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1183/1402	4.30	3.81	4.24	4.15	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1195/1358	4.01	3.54	4.11	4.03	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	719/1316	4.27	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	541/1427	4.54	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1048/1447	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1088/1434	4.28	3.62	4.10	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1258/1387	4.38	4.07	4.46	4.46	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	1179/1387	4.83	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1273/1386	4.00	3.72	4.32	4.32	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1340/1380	4.02	3.63	4.32	4.31	2.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	960/1193	4.04	3.46	4.02	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	812/1172	3.71	3.55	4.15	3.95	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1037/1182	3.93	3.87	4.35	4.18	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1121/1170	3.94	3.80	4.38	4.17	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	701/ 800	3.63	3.41	4.06	3.95	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 110 05
 Title Statics
 Instructor: Irvine,David E
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 694
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	430/1447	4.48	3.90	4.31	4.18	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	741/1447	4.44	3.82	4.27	4.30	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	478/1241	4.54	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	655/1402	4.30	3.81	4.24	4.15	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	590/1358	4.01	3.54	4.11	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	812/1316	4.27	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	568/1427	4.54	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	388/1447	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	309/1434	4.28	3.62	4.10	4.10	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	798/1387	4.38	4.07	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	971/1386	4.00	3.72	4.32	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	799/1380	4.02	3.63	4.32	4.31	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	737/1193	4.04	3.46	4.02	3.99	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	0	9	4.33	521/1172	3.71	3.55	4.15	3.95	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	836/1182	3.93	3.87	4.35	4.18	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	853/1170	3.94	3.80	4.38	4.17	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	683/ 800	3.63	3.41	4.06	3.95	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 110 06
 Title Statics
 Instructor: Irvine,David E
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 695
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	790/1447	4.48	3.90	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	532/1447	4.44	3.82	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	380/1241	4.54	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	603/1402	4.30	3.81	4.24	4.15	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	761/1358	4.01	3.54	4.11	4.03	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	444/1316	4.27	3.78	4.14	3.99	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	398/1427	4.54	3.95	4.19	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	291/1447	4.90	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	812/1434	4.28	3.62	4.10	4.10	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	970/1387	4.38	4.07	4.46	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	829/1387	4.83	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1184/1386	4.00	3.72	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1113/1380	4.02	3.63	4.32	4.31	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	583/1193	4.04	3.46	4.02	3.99	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	3	4	3.27	1056/1172	3.71	3.55	4.15	3.95	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	4	1	8	3.87	963/1182	3.93	3.87	4.35	4.18	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	925/1170	3.94	3.80	4.38	4.17	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	3.63	3.41	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 204 02
 Title Intro Engr Design W/ C
 Instructor: Su,Haijun
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 696
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	6	4	3.42	1356/1447	3.19	3.90	4.31	4.31	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	3	5	4	1	2.53	1430/1447	2.61	3.82	4.27	4.23	2.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	3	6	2	2.89	1225/1241	3.09	4.00	4.33	4.35	2.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	7	4	2	3.06	1356/1402	2.91	3.81	4.24	4.24	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	4	3	2	0	2.07	1350/1358	2.40	3.54	4.11	4.12	2.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	6	5	3	3.28	1218/1316	3.02	3.78	4.14	4.08	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	3	3	5	1	2.47	1399/1427	2.41	3.95	4.19	4.14	2.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	885/1447	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	6	6	5	1	0	2.06	1425/1434	2.25	3.62	4.10	3.97	2.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	7	6	4	3.58	1299/1387	3.36	4.07	4.46	4.42	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	6	7	3	3.47	1364/1387	3.29	4.39	4.73	4.71	3.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	9	5	2	2	1	2.00	1380/1386	2.33	3.72	4.32	4.24	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	5	2	1	2.32	1364/1380	2.61	3.63	4.32	4.30	2.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	6	5	4	2	2	2.42	1164/1193	2.62	3.46	4.02	4.04	2.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	881/1172	3.67	3.55	4.15	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1060/1182	3.48	3.87	4.35	4.30	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1148/1170	2.99	3.80	4.38	4.32	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 800	3.00	3.41	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	187/ 189	3.56	4.35	4.34	4.47	2.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	180/ 192	3.76	4.38	4.34	4.38	3.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	169/ 186	4.00	4.54	4.48	4.57	3.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	139/ 187	4.22	4.64	4.33	4.46	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	149/ 168	3.74	4.27	4.20	4.15	3.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	0	
			? 2			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	3	4	3.19	1391/1447	3.19	3.90	4.31	4.31	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	4	0	4	2.75	1420/1447	2.61	3.82	4.27	4.23	2.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	2	3	3	3	2.81	1227/1241	3.09	4.00	4.33	4.35	2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	5	1	4	2.88	1375/1402	2.91	3.81	4.24	4.24	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	3	1	3	2.85	1322/1358	2.40	3.54	4.11	4.12	2.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	4	2	4	2.94	1265/1316	3.02	3.78	4.14	4.08	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	2	5	3	1	2.67	1388/1427	2.41	3.95	4.19	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	1246/1447	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	1	5	3	0	2.54	1404/1434	2.25	3.62	4.10	3.97	2.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	3	3	3	3.00	1350/1387	3.36	4.07	4.46	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	4	4	4	2	3.13	1379/1387	3.29	4.39	4.73	4.71	3.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	3	2	4	1	2.53	1365/1386	2.33	3.72	4.32	4.24	2.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	4	3	2	2.86	1332/1380	2.61	3.63	4.32	4.30	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	5	0	2	2	3	2.83	1126/1193	2.62	3.46	4.02	4.04	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	881/1172	3.67	3.55	4.15	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1121/1182	3.48	3.87	4.35	4.30	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	1	1	2	1	2.63	1159/1170	2.99	3.80	4.38	4.32	2.63
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	3.41	4.06	4.01	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	87/ 189	3.56	4.35	4.34	4.47	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	138/ 192	3.76	4.38	4.34	4.38	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	141/ 186	4.00	4.54	4.48	4.57	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	114/ 187	4.22	4.64	4.33	4.46	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	107/ 168	3.74	4.27	4.20	4.15	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 204 03
 Title Intro Engr Design W/ C
 Instructor: Su,Haijun
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 697
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 204 04
 Title Intro Engr Design W/ C
 Instructor: Su,Haijun
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 698
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	8	4	2	2.95	1418/1447	3.19	3.90	4.31	4.31	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	9	3	0	2.55	1428/1447	2.61	3.82	4.27	4.23	2.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	8	4	3.55	1129/1241	3.09	4.00	4.33	4.35	3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	3	5	7	0	2.79	1382/1402	2.91	3.81	4.24	4.24	2.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	4	6	2	0	2.29	1345/1358	2.40	3.54	4.11	4.12	2.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	8	3	2	2.84	1275/1316	3.02	3.78	4.14	4.08	2.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	8	2	2	1	2.10	1416/1427	2.41	3.95	4.19	4.14	2.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	6	3	1	0	2.15	1421/1434	2.25	3.62	4.10	3.97	2.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	7	5	3.50	1304/1387	3.36	4.07	4.46	4.42	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	7	8	1	3.25	1375/1387	3.29	4.39	4.73	4.71	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	4	6	3	1	2.45	1370/1386	2.33	3.72	4.32	4.24	2.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	6	6	0	2.65	1347/1380	2.61	3.63	4.32	4.30	2.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	4	4	5	5	0	2.61	1150/1193	2.62	3.46	4.02	4.04	2.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	999/1172	3.67	3.55	4.15	4.12	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1047/1182	3.48	3.87	4.35	4.30	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1070/1170	2.99	3.80	4.38	4.32	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 800	3.00	3.41	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	170/ 189	3.56	4.35	4.34	4.47	3.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	171/ 192	3.76	4.38	4.34	4.38	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	172/ 186	4.00	4.54	4.48	4.57	3.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	128/ 187	4.22	4.64	4.33	4.46	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	145/ 168	3.74	4.27	4.20	4.15	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Course-Section: ENME 217 02
 Title Engr Thermodynamics
 Instructor: Bennett,Dawn
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 699
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 217 03
 Title Engr Thermodynamics
 Instructor: Bennett,Dawn
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 700
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	5	7	2	3.28	1377/1447	3.07	3.90	4.31	4.31	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	8	2	1	2.67	1424/1447	2.94	3.82	4.27	4.23	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	8	1	3.33	1175/1241	3.32	4.00	4.33	4.35	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	4	2	0	1	2.33	1395/1402	2.67	3.81	4.24	4.24	2.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1138/1358	3.36	3.54	4.11	4.12	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	1285/1316	2.92	3.78	4.14	4.08	2.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	9	3	2	3.11	1356/1427	3.24	3.95	4.19	4.14	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	291/1447	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	11	3	3	0	0	1.53	1434/1434	1.91	3.62	4.10	3.97	1.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	7	7	1	1	2.56	1375/1387	2.77	4.07	4.46	4.42	2.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	4	4	3	5	3.28	1374/1387	3.52	4.39	4.73	4.71	3.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	13	3	1	0	1	1.50	1386/1386	2.06	3.72	4.32	4.24	1.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	10	3	2	1	1	1.82	1377/1380	2.16	3.63	4.32	4.30	1.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	8	4	3	1	1	2.00	1177/1193	1.92	3.46	4.02	4.04	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	0	2	4	2	2.71	1144/1172	2.69	3.55	4.15	4.12	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	924/1182	3.77	3.87	4.35	4.30	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	5	2	4	3.46	1082/1170	3.36	3.80	4.38	4.32	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 800	2.11	3.41	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 3			

Course-Section: ENME 217 04
 Title Engr Thermodynamics
 Instructor: Bennett,Dawn
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 701
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	8	11	6	4	3.06	1405/1447	3.07	3.90	4.31	4.31	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	6	13	9	1	3.03	1397/1447	2.94	3.82	4.27	4.23	3.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	5	10	11	4	3.39	1168/1241	3.32	4.00	4.33	4.35	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	14	2	4	4	6	1	3.00	1359/1402	2.67	3.81	4.24	4.24	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	3	3	6	6	3	3.14	1274/1358	3.36	3.54	4.11	4.12	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	10	5	2	7	4	3	2.90	1269/1316	2.92	3.78	4.14	4.08	2.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	8	8	11	4	3.35	1306/1427	3.24	3.95	4.19	4.14	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	485/1447	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	10	9	8	0	0	1.93	1431/1434	1.91	3.62	4.10	3.97	1.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	5	6	11	7	1	2.77	1364/1387	2.77	4.07	4.46	4.42	2.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	5	7	11	7	3.67	1353/1387	3.52	4.39	4.73	4.71	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	12	9	5	3	1	2.07	1379/1386	2.06	3.72	4.32	4.24	2.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	12	5	9	1	1	2.07	1370/1380	2.16	3.63	4.32	4.30	2.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	9	10	4	3	0	2.04	1176/1193	1.92	3.46	4.02	4.04	2.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	6	2	7	5	1	2.67	1150/1172	2.69	3.55	4.15	4.12	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	3	6	4	7	3.62	1050/1182	3.77	3.87	4.35	4.30	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	3	4	4	5	3.26	1116/1170	3.36	3.80	4.38	4.32	3.26
4. Were special techniques successful	15	11	4	1	3	1	0	2.11	794/ 800	2.11	3.41	4.06	4.01	2.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	4.35	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	4.54	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 187	****	4.64	4.33	4.46	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 217 04
 Title Engr Thermodynamics
 Instructor: Bennett,Dawn
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 701
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 217 05
 Title Engr Thermodynamics
 Instructor: Bennett,Dawn
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 702
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	18	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1428/1447	3.07	3.90	4.31	4.31	2.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	18	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1388/1447	2.94	3.82	4.27	4.23	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	18	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1188/1241	3.32	4.00	4.33	4.35	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	18	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1402	2.67	3.81	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	3	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/1358	3.36	3.54	4.11	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1243/1316	2.92	3.78	4.14	4.08	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	18	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1331/1427	3.24	3.95	4.19	4.14	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	1	3	3	0	0	2.29	1415/1434	1.91	3.62	4.10	3.97	2.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1350/1387	2.77	4.07	4.46	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1357/1387	3.52	4.39	4.73	4.71	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	3	2	2	0	2.63	1361/1386	2.06	3.72	4.32	4.24	2.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1353/1380	2.16	3.63	4.32	4.30	2.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	0	3	3	1	0	0	1.71	1185/1193	1.92	3.46	4.02	4.04	1.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	****/1172	2.69	3.55	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/1182	3.77	3.87	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	****/1170	3.36	3.80	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 800	2.11	3.41	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ENME 221 02
 Title Dynamics
 Instructor: Irvine,David E
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 703
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	397/1447	4.43	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	196/1447	4.40	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	195/1241	4.47	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	238/1402	4.52	3.81	4.24	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	973/1358	3.56	3.54	4.11	4.12	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	274/1316	4.11	3.78	4.14	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	237/1427	4.46	3.95	4.19	4.14	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	538/1447	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	9	12	4.41	454/1434	4.12	3.62	4.10	3.97	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	656/1387	4.49	4.07	4.46	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	6	6	12	4.12	988/1386	3.90	3.72	4.32	4.24	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	7	9	3.88	1113/1380	3.76	3.63	4.32	4.30	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	5	9	7	3.91	748/1193	3.63	3.46	4.02	4.04	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	479/1172	3.21	3.55	4.15	4.12	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	898/1182	3.09	3.87	4.35	4.30	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	725/1170	3.74	3.80	4.38	4.32	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	4	18	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 19	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 13					
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

Course-Section: ENME 221 03
 Title Dynamics
 Instructor: Irvine,David E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 704
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	474/1447	4.43	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	677/1447	4.40	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	541/1241	4.47	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	685/1402	4.52	3.81	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	952/1358	3.56	3.54	4.11	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	812/1316	4.11	3.78	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1427	4.46	3.95	4.19	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	296/1434	4.12	3.62	4.10	3.97	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1387	4.49	4.07	4.46	4.42	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.92	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	811/1386	3.90	3.72	4.32	4.24	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	915/1380	3.76	3.63	4.32	4.30	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	831/1193	3.63	3.46	4.02	4.04	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	0	1	2.88	1122/1172	3.21	3.55	4.15	4.12	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1168/1182	3.09	3.87	4.35	4.30	2.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1070/1170	3.74	3.80	4.38	4.32	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 221 04
 Title Dynamics
 Instructor: Irvine,David E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 705
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1058/1447	4.43	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1053/1447	4.40	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	887/1241	4.47	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	494/1402	4.52	3.81	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	0	3	1	3.00	1291/1358	3.56	3.54	4.11	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1020/1316	4.11	3.78	4.14	4.08	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1427	4.46	3.95	4.19	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.93	4.83	4.69	4.70	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1283/1434	4.12	3.62	4.10	3.97	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1150/1387	4.49	4.07	4.46	4.42	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	859/1387	4.92	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1299/1386	3.90	3.72	4.32	4.24	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1304/1380	3.76	3.63	4.32	4.30	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	1050/1193	3.63	3.46	4.02	4.04	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1159/1172	3.21	3.55	4.15	4.12	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	4	1	1	2	2.70	1164/1182	3.09	3.87	4.35	4.30	2.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	4	5	0	3.40	1100/1170	3.74	3.80	4.38	4.32	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENME 301 01
 Title Struct/Prop:Engr Mater
 Instructor: Farrokh,Babak
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 706
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	190/1447	4.86	3.90	4.31	4.32	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	179/1447	4.83	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	150/1241	4.89	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	238/1402	4.74	3.81	4.24	4.24	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	0	2	3	17	4.52	332/1358	4.52	3.54	4.11	4.10	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	188/1316	4.73	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	92/1427	4.89	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	108/1434	4.83	3.62	4.10	4.09	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	80/1387	4.97	4.07	4.46	4.44	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	229/1386	4.83	3.72	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	170/1380	4.90	3.63	4.32	4.32	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	155/1193	4.71	3.46	4.02	4.05	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	309/1172	4.63	3.55	4.15	4.24	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.87	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1170	4.88	3.80	4.38	4.49	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 25	Graduate 0	Major 27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 29	Non-major 2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1290/1447	3.67	3.90	4.31	4.32	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	1114/1447	3.93	3.82	4.27	4.23	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1148/1402	3.79	3.81	4.24	4.24	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.54	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	812/1316	4.00	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	763/1427	4.27	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	4	7	1	3.50	1238/1434	3.50	3.62	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1124/1387	4.13	4.07	4.46	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	630/1387	4.87	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1298/1386	3.27	3.72	4.32	4.30	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	5	3.53	1237/1380	3.53	3.63	4.32	4.32	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	2	5	3	3.38	1005/1193	3.38	3.46	4.02	4.05	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1034/1172	3.36	3.55	4.15	4.24	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1045/1182	3.64	3.87	4.35	4.42	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	1111/1170	3.30	3.80	4.38	4.49	3.30
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.41	4.06	4.12	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 189	4.82	4.35	4.34	4.26	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	147/ 192	4.22	4.38	4.34	4.20	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	104/ 186	4.63	4.54	4.48	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 187	4.89	4.64	4.33	4.11	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 168	4.78	4.27	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: ENME 303 02
 Title Topics In Engineer Mat
 Instructor: Vonkerczek,Chri
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 708
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1447	3.67	3.90	4.31	4.32	****	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1447	3.93	3.82	4.27	4.23	****	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.67	4.00	4.33	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	3.79	3.81	4.24	4.24	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	4.00	3.54	4.11	4.10	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	4.00	3.78	4.14	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1427	4.27	3.95	4.19	4.15	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1447	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.65	****	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1434	3.50	3.62	4.10	4.09	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.13	4.07	4.46	4.44	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.87	4.39	4.73	4.71	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	3.27	3.72	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	3.53	3.63	4.32	4.32	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	3.36	3.55	4.15	4.24	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	3.64	3.87	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	3.30	3.80	4.38	4.49	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	27/ 189	4.82	4.35	4.34	4.26	4.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	100/ 192	4.22	4.38	4.34	4.20	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	52/ 186	4.63	4.54	4.48	4.36	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	44/ 187	4.89	4.64	4.33	4.11	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	15/ 168	4.78	4.27	4.20	4.02	4.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENME 304 01
 Title Machine Design
 Instructor: Majid, Abdul
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 709
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	12	15	10	8	3.12	1399/1447	3.12	3.90	4.31	4.32	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	5	18	11	13	3.52	1315/1447	3.52	3.82	4.27	4.23	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	13	19	13	3.82	1047/1241	3.82	4.00	4.33	4.33	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	4	11	10	10	11	3.28	1322/1402	3.28	3.81	4.24	4.24	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	1	3	9	15	14	3.90	917/1358	3.90	3.54	4.11	4.10	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	11	7	1	8	10	10	3.42	1168/1316	3.42	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	4	8	15	16	3.69	1192/1427	3.69	3.95	4.19	4.15	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	46	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	10	18	11	2	3.02	1347/1434	3.02	3.62	4.10	4.09	3.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	4	17	6	20	3.78	1258/1387	3.78	4.07	4.46	4.44	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	4	7	12	7	19	3.61	1358/1387	3.61	4.39	4.73	4.71	3.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	12	16	9	3.35	1289/1386	3.35	3.72	4.32	4.30	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	13	8	9	10	8	2.83	1334/1380	2.83	3.63	4.32	4.32	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	37	6	1	1	2	0	1.90	****/1193	****	3.46	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	4	2	1	1	2.88	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	****	4.35	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 44	Graduate 0 Major 40
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 25		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 51 Non-major 11
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 320 01
 Title Fluid Mechanics
 Instructor: Carmi, Shlomo
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 710
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1230/1447	3.82	3.90	4.31	4.32	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1141/1447	3.91	3.82	4.27	4.23	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	766/1241	4.27	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1286/1402	3.40	3.81	4.24	4.24	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1257/1358	3.22	3.54	4.11	4.10	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1020/1316	3.71	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	751/1427	4.27	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	996/1434	3.89	3.62	4.10	4.09	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1250/1387	3.82	4.07	4.46	4.44	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	1107/1387	4.55	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1309/1386	3.18	3.72	4.32	4.30	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	2	3.09	1312/1380	3.09	3.63	4.32	4.32	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	224/1193	4.60	3.46	4.02	4.05	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	3.55	4.15	4.24	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	3.87	4.35	4.42	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.80	4.38	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	10	15	18	3.90	1166/1447	3.90	3.90	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	12	17	15	3.85	1175/1447	3.85	3.82	4.27	4.23	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	15	24	4.21	822/1241	4.21	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	16	13	11	3.70	1191/1402	3.70	3.81	4.24	4.24	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	8	15	10	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.54	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	14	14	13	3.72	1020/1316	3.72	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	7	16	18	3.88	1097/1427	3.88	3.95	4.19	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	3	12	16	4	3.53	1228/1434	3.53	3.62	4.10	4.09	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	7	33	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.07	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	1	4	8	30	4.40	1203/1387	4.40	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	7	13	21	4.14	979/1386	4.14	3.72	4.32	4.30	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	12	9	18	3.76	1165/1380	3.76	3.63	4.32	4.32	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	5	2	11	9	16	3.67	889/1193	3.67	3.46	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	37	6	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 14	Required for Majors 41	Graduate 1 Major 37
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 7	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 47 Non-major 11
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		

I	0	Other	0
?	2		

Course-Section: ENME 332 02
 Title Solid Mech And Mat Lab
 Instructor: Arola,Dwayne D
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 712
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	463/1447	4.54	3.90	4.31	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	702/1447	4.35	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	5	4.06	900/1241	3.98	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	150/1402	4.46	3.81	4.24	4.24	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	917/1358	3.80	3.54	4.11	4.10	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	283/1316	4.50	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	811/1427	4.19	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	262/1434	4.30	3.62	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	230/1387	4.96	4.07	4.46	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	431/1386	4.74	3.72	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	312/1380	4.63	3.63	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	5	2	6	3.67	895/1193	3.70	3.46	4.02	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1172	4.75	3.55	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1182	4.29	3.87	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	657/1170	4.03	3.80	4.38	4.49	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	118/ 189	4.49	4.35	4.34	4.26	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	96/ 192	4.63	4.38	4.34	4.20	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	82/ 186	4.72	4.54	4.48	4.36	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	95/ 187	4.70	4.64	4.33	4.11	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	87/ 168	4.21	4.27	4.20	4.02	4.23

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 332 03
 Title Solid Mech And Mat Lab
 Instructor: Arola,Dwayne D
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 713
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	790/1447	4.54	3.90	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	619/1447	4.35	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	806/1241	3.98	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	797/1402	4.46	3.81	4.24	4.24	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1022/1358	3.80	3.54	4.11	4.10	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	644/1316	4.50	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	811/1427	4.19	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	803/1447	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	786/1434	4.30	3.62	4.10	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.96	4.07	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	431/1386	4.74	3.72	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	463/1380	4.63	3.63	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	786/1193	3.70	3.46	4.02	4.05	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1172	4.75	3.55	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1182	4.29	3.87	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	4.03	3.80	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 189	4.49	4.35	4.34	4.26	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	65/ 192	4.63	4.38	4.34	4.20	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	52/ 186	4.72	4.54	4.48	4.36	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	50/ 187	4.70	4.64	4.33	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	107/ 168	4.21	4.27	4.20	4.02	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENME 332 03
 Title Solid Mech And Mat Lab
 Instructor: Arola,Dwayne D
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 713
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 332 04
 Title Solid Mech And Mat Lab
 Instructor: Arola,Dwayne D
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 714
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	408/1447	4.54	3.90	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	882/1447	4.35	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1096/1241	3.98	4.00	4.33	4.33	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	685/1402	4.46	3.81	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1022/1358	3.80	3.54	4.11	4.10	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1316	4.50	3.78	4.14	4.13	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	906/1427	4.19	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	733/1434	4.30	3.62	4.10	4.09	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	4.96	4.07	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.74	3.72	4.32	4.30	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	719/1380	4.63	3.63	4.32	4.32	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	936/1193	3.70	3.46	4.02	4.05	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	377/1172	4.75	3.55	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	737/1182	4.29	3.87	4.35	4.42	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1013/1170	4.03	3.80	4.38	4.49	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	36/ 189	4.49	4.35	4.34	4.26	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	34/ 192	4.63	4.38	4.34	4.20	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	42/ 186	4.72	4.54	4.48	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 187	4.70	4.64	4.33	4.11	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	64/ 168	4.21	4.27	4.20	4.02	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: ENME 360 01
 Title Vibrations
 Instructor: Zhu, Weidong
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 715
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	9	15	14	4.13	980/1447	4.13	3.90	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	11	20	4.34	753/1447	4.34	3.82	4.27	4.23	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	26	4.58	478/1241	4.58	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	2	2	13	4	10	3.58	1234/1402	3.58	3.81	4.24	4.24	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	2	7	10	10	3.87	945/1358	3.87	3.54	4.11	4.10	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	4	1	6	9	9	3.62	1075/1316	3.62	3.78	4.14	4.13	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	7	24	4.39	608/1427	4.39	3.95	4.19	4.15	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	34	4.89	511/1447	4.89	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	12	11	2	3.54	1223/1434	3.54	3.62	4.10	4.09	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	8	11	15	4.14	1118/1387	4.14	4.07	4.46	4.44	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	8	21	4.44	1179/1387	4.44	4.39	4.73	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	14	11	5	3.40	1283/1386	3.40	3.72	4.32	4.30	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	10	12	10	3.83	1143/1380	3.83	3.63	4.32	4.32	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	7	2	3	4	2	2.56	1154/1193	2.56	3.46	4.02	4.05	2.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 23	Required for Majors 33	Graduate 0	Major 29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 38	Non-major 9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENME 403 01
 Title Automatic Controls
 Instructor: Tasch,Uri
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 716
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	585/1447	4.50	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	376/1447	4.64	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	251/1241	4.79	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	7	1	3.80	1139/1402	3.80	3.81	4.24	4.34	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	1339/1358	2.50	3.54	4.11	4.15	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	985/1316	3.78	3.78	4.14	4.27	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	823/1427	4.21	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	619/1447	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	634/1434	4.25	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	684/1387	4.58	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	681/1387	4.85	4.39	4.73	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	577/1386	4.54	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	534/1380	4.62	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	960/1193	3.50	3.46	4.02	4.00	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 423 01
 Title Heat, Vent, AC Design
 Instructor: Fisher, Jesse A.
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 717
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	331/1447	4.74	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	162/1447	4.84	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	195/1241	4.84	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	238/1402	4.73	3.81	4.24	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	529/1358	4.33	3.54	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	112/1316	4.83	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	328/1427	4.61	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1124/1447	4.44	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	117/1434	4.80	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	398/1387	4.78	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	290/1386	4.78	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	238/1380	4.83	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	314/1193	4.47	3.46	4.02	4.00	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		10	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ENME 432 02
 Title Fluids/Energy Lab
 Instructor: Zhu,Liang
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 718
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	654/1447	4.45	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	728/1447	4.36	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	249/1402	4.73	3.81	4.24	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1147/1358	3.56	3.54	4.11	4.15	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	292/1316	4.60	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	644/1427	4.36	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	928/1447	4.70	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	278/1434	4.60	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	200/1387	4.90	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.39	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.80	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	549/1380	4.60	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	593/1193	4.13	3.46	4.02	4.00	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1042/1172	3.33	3.55	4.15	4.25	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 189	4.75	4.35	4.34	4.74	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.38	4.34	4.61	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	52/ 186	4.75	4.54	4.48	4.72	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 187	5.00	4.64	4.33	4.59	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	17/ 168	4.75	4.27	4.20	4.53	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 444 02
 Title Mech Engr Systems Desi
 Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 719
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	7	7	1	1	2.22	1443/1447	2.14	3.90	4.31	4.43	2.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	7	4	0	2.43	1434/1447	2.56	3.82	4.27	4.31	2.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	4	8	6	0	2.81	1228/1241	2.97	4.00	4.33	4.41	2.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	11	3	2	2.83	1380/1402	2.88	3.81	4.24	4.34	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	6	5	3	1	0	1.93	1354/1358	2.67	3.54	4.11	4.15	1.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	6	4	7	3	0	2.35	1306/1316	2.41	3.78	4.14	4.27	2.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	10	6	5	0	2.68	1385/1427	2.64	3.95	4.19	4.20	2.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	1066/1447	4.57	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	6	6	9	2	0	2.30	1415/1434	2.35	3.62	4.10	4.17	2.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	5	9	3	1	2.64	1371/1387	2.92	4.07	4.46	4.48	2.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	6	8	3	3.32	1372/1387	3.23	4.39	4.73	4.76	3.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	4	7	6	0	2.64	1360/1386	2.82	3.72	4.32	4.34	2.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	5	7	4	0	2.41	1361/1380	2.47	3.63	4.32	4.34	2.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	4	3	5	2	0	2.36	1168/1193	2.46	3.46	4.02	4.00	2.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	****	4.35	4.34	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors		19	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	8	2	4	1	1	2.06	1445/1447	2.14	3.90	4.31	4.43	2.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	3	1	2.69	1424/1447	2.56	3.82	4.27	4.31	2.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	2	3	3.13	1209/1241	2.97	4.00	4.33	4.41	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	5	4	1	2.93	1368/1402	2.88	3.81	4.24	4.34	2.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1212/1358	2.67	3.54	4.11	4.15	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	2	5	1	1	2.46	1301/1316	2.41	3.78	4.14	4.27	2.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	3	4	3	1	2.60	1397/1427	2.64	3.95	4.19	4.20	2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1008/1447	4.57	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	4	7	1	0	2.40	1412/1434	2.35	3.62	4.10	4.17	2.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	5	4	2	3.20	1337/1387	2.92	4.07	4.46	4.48	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	2	4	2	4	3.13	1379/1387	3.23	4.39	4.73	4.76	3.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	6	3	1	3.00	1328/1386	2.82	3.72	4.32	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	1	1	2.53	1355/1380	2.47	3.63	4.32	4.34	2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	0	5	0	1	2.56	1154/1193	2.46	3.46	4.02	4.00	2.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 189	****	4.35	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 186	****	4.54	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 187	****	4.64	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.27	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	Major 12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	General 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Under-grad 16
					Non-major 4
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough

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

Course-Section: ENME 471 02
 Title Comp Aided Fin El Desi
 Instructor: Charalambides,P
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 721
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	551/1447	4.72	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	315/1447	4.40	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	439/1241	4.51	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1402	4.50	3.81	4.24	4.34	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	751/1358	4.26	3.54	4.11	4.15	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	283/1316	4.36	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	191/1427	4.63	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	388/1447	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	117/1434	4.75	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1387	4.82	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	392/1386	4.55	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	699/1380	4.53	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	593/1193	3.88	3.46	4.02	4.00	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1172	3.75	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	4.00	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1170	3.50	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	99/ 189	4.59	4.35	4.34	4.74	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	51/ 192	4.73	4.38	4.34	4.61	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	32/ 186	4.68	4.54	4.48	4.72	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/ 187	4.80	4.64	4.33	4.59	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	40/ 168	4.66	4.27	4.20	4.53	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Course-Section: ENME 471 03
 Title Comp Aided Fin El Desi
 Instructor: Charalambides,P
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 722
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1447	4.72	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	993/1447	4.40	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	658/1241	4.51	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	715/1402	4.50	3.81	4.24	4.34	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	430/1358	4.26	3.54	4.11	4.15	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	758/1316	4.36	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	459/1427	4.63	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	206/1434	4.75	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.82	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	748/1386	4.55	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	549/1380	4.53	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	916/1193	3.88	3.46	4.02	4.00	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	881/1172	3.75	3.55	4.15	4.25	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	3.87	4.35	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1070/1170	3.50	3.80	4.38	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 189	4.59	4.35	4.34	4.74	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	43/ 192	4.73	4.38	4.34	4.61	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	104/ 186	4.68	4.54	4.48	4.72	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	50/ 187	4.80	4.64	4.33	4.59	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	17/ 168	4.66	4.27	4.20	4.53	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General	1	Under-grad	10 Non-major 3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: ENME 482 02
 Title Controls/Vib Lab
 Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 723
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	1442/1447	2.44	3.90	4.31	4.43	2.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	1438/1447	2.17	3.82	4.27	4.31	2.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1235/1241	2.47	4.00	4.33	4.41	2.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	1392/1402	2.71	3.81	4.24	4.34	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	1355/1358	1.96	3.54	4.11	4.15	1.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1314/1316	2.78	3.78	4.14	4.27	1.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1413/1427	2.94	3.95	4.19	4.20	2.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1155/1447	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1427/1434	2.17	3.62	4.10	4.17	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1382/1387	2.62	4.07	4.46	4.48	2.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1387/1387	3.24	4.39	4.73	4.76	2.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1378/1386	2.91	3.72	4.32	4.34	2.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1379/1380	1.94	3.63	4.32	4.34	1.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1186/1193	2.42	3.46	4.02	4.00	1.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	87/ 189	4.50	4.35	4.34	4.74	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	89/ 192	4.50	4.38	4.34	4.61	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.54	4.48	4.72	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	98/ 187	4.50	4.64	4.33	4.59	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.27	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 482 03
 Title Controls/Vib Lab
 Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 724
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	4	6	0	0	2.00	1446/1447	2.44	3.90	4.31	4.43	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	5	4	2	0	2.19	1442/1447	2.17	3.82	4.27	4.31	2.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	3	2	2	1	2.06	1236/1241	2.47	4.00	4.33	4.41	2.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	3	3	2	2	2.64	1388/1402	2.71	3.81	4.24	4.34	2.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1348/1358	1.96	3.54	4.11	4.15	2.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	6	2	3	1	2.53	1297/1316	2.78	3.78	4.14	4.27	2.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	4	2	2	2.63	1394/1427	2.94	3.95	4.19	4.20	2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	619/1447	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	4	4	3	0	2.50	1407/1434	2.17	3.62	4.10	4.17	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	4	3	2	2	2.60	1373/1387	2.62	4.07	4.46	4.48	2.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	0	3	7	2	3.33	1371/1387	3.24	4.39	4.73	4.76	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	2	4	3	1	2.53	1365/1386	2.91	3.72	4.32	4.34	2.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	2	4	1	1	2.21	1368/1380	1.94	3.63	4.32	4.34	2.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	1	3	3	0	2.60	1151/1193	2.42	3.46	4.02	4.00	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1172	****	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1182	****	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1170	****	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 189	4.50	4.35	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 192	4.50	4.38	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 186	5.00	4.54	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 187	4.50	4.64	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 168	****	4.27	4.20	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 482 04
 Title Controls/Vib Lab
 Instructor: Tshibangu,Wa-Mu
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 725
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1411/1447	2.44	3.90	4.31	4.43	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1444/1447	2.17	3.82	4.27	4.31	2.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1215/1241	2.47	4.00	4.33	4.41	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1402	2.71	3.81	4.24	4.34	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	812/1316	2.78	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	971/1427	2.94	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1427/1434	2.17	3.62	4.10	4.17	2.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1350/1387	2.62	4.07	4.46	4.48	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1320/1387	3.24	4.39	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	2.91	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1371/1380	1.94	3.63	4.32	4.34	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1087/1193	2.42	3.46	4.02	4.00	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 489 01
 Title Spec Topics In Mech En
 Instructor: Topoleski,L D
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 726
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	13	23	4.54	540/1447	4.42	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	17	19	4.49	561/1447	4.27	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	26	4.64	415/1241	4.37	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	10	21	4.39	635/1402	4.03	3.81	4.24	4.34	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	5	10	18	4.20	663/1358	3.80	3.54	4.11	4.15	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	14	17	4.22	644/1316	4.02	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	3	13	16	4.17	858/1427	4.21	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	0	11	17	4.29	589/1434	4.27	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	6	26	4.63	626/1387	4.47	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	475/1387	4.86	4.39	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	10	24	4.66	444/1386	4.44	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	10	25	4.71	392/1380	4.43	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	3	5	8	16	4.16	564/1193	4.28	3.46	4.02	4.00	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	****/1172	3.60	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	553/1182	4.50	3.87	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	798/1170	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.51	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	27	6	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.35	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENME 489 01
 Title Spec Topics In Mech En
 Instructor: Topoleski, L D
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 726
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	5	Major	36
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	18	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENME 489 02
 Title Spec Topics In Mech En
 Instructor: Zupan,Marcus
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 727
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	810/1447	4.42	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	7	4.05	1029/1447	4.27	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	882/1241	4.37	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	3	3	10	4	3.75	1163/1402	4.03	3.81	4.24	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	5	8	5	3.75	1022/1358	3.80	3.54	4.11	4.15	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	785/1316	4.02	3.78	4.14	4.27	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	751/1427	4.21	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1447	4.96	4.83	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	701/1434	4.27	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	1111/1387	4.47	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	0	17	4.74	889/1387	4.86	4.39	4.73	4.76	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	903/1386	4.44	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	2	12	4.26	877/1380	4.43	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	217/1193	4.28	3.46	4.02	4.00	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1172	3.60	3.55	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/1182	4.50	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1170	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	5 Graduate 3 Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 20 Non-major 6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	10
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 489 04
 Title Spec Topics In Mech En
 Instructor: Mogavero, Marc A
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 728
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	742/1447	4.42	3.90	4.31	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	834/1447	4.27	3.82	4.27	4.31	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	675/1241	4.37	4.00	4.33	4.41	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1036/1402	4.03	3.81	4.24	4.34	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	8	2	3.44	1195/1358	3.80	3.54	4.11	4.15	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	8	4	3.78	985/1316	4.02	3.78	4.14	4.27	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	850/1427	4.21	3.95	4.19	4.20	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.96	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	565/1434	4.27	3.62	4.10	4.17	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	626/1387	4.47	4.07	4.46	4.48	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	369/1387	4.86	4.39	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	705/1386	4.44	3.72	4.32	4.34	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	831/1380	4.43	3.63	4.32	4.34	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	624/1193	4.28	3.46	4.02	4.00	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	958/1172	3.60	3.55	4.15	4.25	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1182	4.50	3.87	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1170	4.20	3.80	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	10
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	3.90	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	532/1447	4.50	3.82	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.00	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	827/1402	4.20	3.81	4.24	4.29	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	280/1358	4.60	3.54	4.11	4.26	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	700/1316	4.17	3.78	4.14	4.34	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1427	5.00	3.95	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	3.62	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.07	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.39	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	217/1386	4.83	3.72	4.32	4.43	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	463/1380	4.67	3.63	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	813/1193	3.80	3.46	4.02	4.02	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	3.55	4.15	4.32	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	3.87	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	576/1170	4.50	3.80	4.38	4.52	4.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 640 1
 Title Fund Fluid Mech I
 Instructor: Eggleton, Charle
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 730
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1159/1447	3.91	3.90	4.31	4.46	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1141/1447	3.91	3.82	4.27	4.30	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	833/1241	4.18	4.00	4.33	4.38	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1188/1402	3.70	3.81	4.24	4.29	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	5	0	3.20	1262/1358	3.20	3.54	4.11	4.26	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1014/1316	3.73	3.78	4.14	4.34	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	596/1427	4.40	3.95	4.19	4.25	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.74	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1088/1434	3.75	3.62	4.10	4.21	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	850/1387	4.45	4.07	4.46	4.51	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1018/1387	4.64	4.39	4.73	4.81	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	3.72	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	3.63	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	602/1193	4.11	3.46	4.02	4.02	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	978/1172	3.56	3.55	4.15	4.32	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	856/1182	4.00	3.87	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.80	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	683/ 800	3.40	3.41	4.06	4.10	3.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.35	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.38	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	****	4.54	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.64	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.27	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: ENME 640 1
 Title Fund Fluid Mech I
 Instructor: Eggleton, Charle
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 730
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 677 1
 Title Applied Elasticity
 Instructor: Farquhar, Anthon
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 731
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	3.90	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	1	5	7	2	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	3.82	4.27	4.30	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	3	1	4	6	2	3.19	1200/1241	3.19	4.00	4.33	4.38	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	6	2	0	2	5	0	3.11	1352/1402	3.11	3.81	4.24	4.29	3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	2	4	4	3	3.43	1203/1358	3.43	3.54	4.11	4.26	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	9	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	3.78	4.14	4.34	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	971/1427	4.00	3.95	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1003/1434	3.88	3.62	4.10	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	0	7	3	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.07	4.46	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1173/1387	4.45	4.39	4.73	4.81	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1169/1386	3.82	3.72	4.32	4.43	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1148/1380	3.82	3.63	4.32	4.38	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/1193	****	3.46	4.02	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	1125/1172	2.86	3.55	4.15	4.32	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1060/1182	3.57	3.87	4.35	4.46	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	827/1170	4.14	3.80	4.38	4.52	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 800	****	3.41	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 8	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 4	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Under-grad 17	Non-major 14
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives		
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		
				? 1			

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant