Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010 University of Maryland

Page 851 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: GRINER, ANITA E (Instr. A) Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

Ctudent	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vou	gain new	General insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	803/1	649	4.38	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.38
		or make clear			0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	,		4.31	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.31
		stions reflect	_	_	1	0	0	1	1	7		4.00	950/1			4.38	4.27		4.00
		tions reflect			0	1	0	0	3	6	3		1067/1			4.38	4.20	4.35	4.00
			_	hat you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4			1119/1		3.69		4.04	4.28	3.69
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.54			4.54		4.10		4.54
		system clearly			0	0	1	1	0	4	7		926/1		4.15	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.15
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00		646		4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
	_			ing effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1				4.06	4.20	
		Lecture	9																
1. Were th	e instruc	tor's lectures	s well p	repared	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1	568	4.62	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.62
		or seem intere			11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1	572	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.54
		_		plained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1	564	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.50
		contribute to			11	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/1			4.34	4.29	4.41	
5. Did aud	iovisual	techniques enh	nance yo	ur understanding	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1	352	4.42	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.42
		Discuss																	
				hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7				4.64		4.08	4.30	4.64
		_	_	to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5		4.55	585/1			4.49	4.29		4.55
				open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.55	624/1			4.43	4.30		4.55
4. were sp	. Were special techniques successful					0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	370/	948	4.18	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.18
5. Were re	Laboratory  . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	355/	555	4.25	4.01	4.29	4.66	4.25
		Seminar	2																
5. Were cr	iteria fo	or grading made	e clear		9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	229/	288	3.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	3.00
		Field W																	
5. Did con	ferences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	270/	312	2.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	2.75
1 541	£	Self I			1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	*****/	F 2	****	2 67	4 20	4 27	****
	_	-		hat you learned	12 12	0	0	0	0	1	0 1	5.00	****/ ****/	53 30	****	3.67 ****	4.30 4.16	4.37 4.49	****
		ons make clear ts with the ir			12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	****	4.10	4.43	****
_		th proctors for		_	11	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/		****	4.00	3.99	3.92	***
5. Weie tii	ere enoug	n proctors for	all th						-	Τ.	U	4.00	, , , ,	110		4.00	3.99	3.92	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ition	1										
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	sons	:				Тур	oe .			Majors	}
00-27						Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Grad	uate	=======================================	5	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1					Ger	neral	_				3	Unde	r-gı	rad	8	Non-	major	13
84-150														_				-	
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	res				0	####	- N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
	Р 0												resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0 ? 0					Oth	ner					7							
				· -															

Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL

Instructor:

PETER, JAMES (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 852 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	From	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	803/1649	4.38	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	839/1648	4.31	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7		4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.38	4.27		4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6			1067/1595	4.00	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4			1119/1533	3.69	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1 0	4		4.54	359/1512	4.54		4.10	4.35	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	0	4 0		4.15	926/1623 1/1646	4.15 5.00	4.22	4.16	4.29 4.81	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	754/1621			4.06	4.20	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1212/1572	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4		4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5		4.46	749/1559	4.46	4.34	4.29	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	389/1352	4.42	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.42
Discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	-	1 61	251/1204	1 61	4 20	4 00	4 20	1 61
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4 5		4.64	351/1384 585/1382	4.55	4.39	4.08	4.30 4.52	4.64 4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.43	4.29	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	7			370/ 948		4.24		4.03	
	_	· ·	ŭ	Ü	_	•	J	1.10	3,0, 310	1.10		3.75	1.05	1.10
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	355/ 555	4.25	4.01	4.29	4.66	4.25
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	3.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	270/ 312	2.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	2.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12 12	0	0	0	0	0 1	1		****/ 30 ****/ 41	****	****	4.16	4.49 4.43	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	1	-		****/ 110	****	4.00			****
			-	_	Ü	1	U	4.00	/ 110		4.00	3.99	3.94	
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 1 A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	5	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	13
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0									5-				3 -	
Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 1 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - I					h
P 0									response	es to k	e sign	ificar	nt	
3 O I O		Otl	her					7						

MGMT, LEADERSHIP AND CO

Title Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 853 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	265/1649	4.77	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.81
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	168/1648	4.77	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.88
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	258/1375	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.79
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	236/1595	4.71	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	119/1533	4.67	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.88
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	77/1512	4.77	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.94
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	164/1623	4.71	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.81
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	thing effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	234/1621	4.71	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.67
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	372/1568	4.87	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.81
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	253/1564	4.81	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.81
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	238/1559		4.34	4.29	4.41	4.88
				our understanding	2	0	0	1	2	2		4.44					4.10	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	105/1384	4.90	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.94
					2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1382		4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00
	e all students actively encouraged to participal the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:				2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94			4.43	4.30	4.56	4.94
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi Were special techniques successful				2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	122/ 948		4.24	3.95	4.03	
	Laboratory																	
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.66	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clear		16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.60	3.81	3.68	3.83	****
		Self	Paced															
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea	r the e	expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	***	****	4.43	4.43	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	-27 2 0.00-0.99 2 A 11								 or Ma			0	 Graduat		 7	Majo		0
28-55						1/6/	4u11,	Ju I	JI 110	בטני.	D	J	Graduat	_	,	Ma JC	<i>,</i> _	U
56-83						Cer	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	4
84-150					361	c.a.	-				5	onder -g	144 1		14011	101	I	
Grad.				F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0					Otl	ner				1	1						

MGMT, LEADERSHIP AND CO

Title

Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 854 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	350/1649	4.77	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	362/1648	4.77	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	840/1375	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	321/1595	4.71	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	410/1533	4.67	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	310/1512	4.77	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	395/1623	4.71	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	165/1621	4.71	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	171/1568	4.87	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.07	4.82	4.43	4.83	4.93
	2	0	0	0	0	3	12			4.97			4.83	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0		0	0		13	4.80	263/1564		4.29	4.28		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2		4.87	250/1559	4.87	4.34	4.29		4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	U	U	U	2	6	7	4.33	457/1352	4.39	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	170/1384	4.90	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	170/1382	4.97	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	306/1368	4.90	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	104/ 948	4.78	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.91	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	323/ 555	4.40		4.29		4.40
Quantity and														
Seminar	1 -	0	•	0	0	_	_	4 00	****	als als als als	2 26	2 60	2 0 1	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	215/ 312	3.60	3.81	3.68	3.83	3.60
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****
the resument, excepting of proceeds neighbor		_	3	3	3	_	J	1.00	, 21				1.07	

Title MGMT, LEADERSHIP AND CO

Instructor: I

IZENBERG, ILLYS

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 854 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	А	 7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS OLIVER, MICHAEL (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment:

13 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 855 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1070/1648	4.09	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	763/1375	4.30	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	217/1533	4.70	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	1		1434/1623	3.40	4.22	4.16	4.29	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1105/1621	3.79	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.71	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	511/1564	4.47	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	306/1559	4.76	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	7	2	4.00	690/1352	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	412/1384	4.55	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	666/1382	4.45	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.91	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	4.43	4.12	4.61	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.95	4.35	4.80	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	4.01	4.29	4.66	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.38	4.47	4.50	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	51/ 81	4.33	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	38/ 52	3.67	4.18	4.06	4.51	3.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.58	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	22/ 39	4.33	4.62	4.38	4.44	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	42/ 53	3.67	3.67	4.30	4.37	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	1.00		****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	3.92	4.00

Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS

Instructor: OLIVER, MICHAEL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 855 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

G 656 8010 University of Maryland

ENGR LAW AND ETHICS Baltimore County

Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS
Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 856 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	4		1070/1648	4.09	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	763/1375	4.30	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	217/1533	4.70	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	4.22	4.16	4.29	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1225/1621	3.79	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	588/1568	4.71	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	887/1564	4.47	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	475/1559	4.76	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	633/1352	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	412/1384	4.55	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	666/1382	4.45	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.91	4.16	4.27	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	4.43	4.12	4.61	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.95	4.35	4.80	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	4.01	4.29	4.66	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.38	4.47	4.50	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	51/ 81	4.33	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	38/ 52	3.67	4.18	4.06	4.51	3.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.58	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	22/ 39	4.33	4.62	4.38	4.44	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	42/ 53	3.67	3.67	4.30	4.37	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	3.92	4.00

Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS

Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

AW AND ETHICS Baltimore County, RICHARD (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Page 856 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

Title FIN DECISION-MAKING EN

Instructor: FENTON, ROBERT

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14

Baltimore County

Page 857

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	miei	ncie	=		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	844/1649	4.36	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	943/1648	4.21	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	347/1375	4.71	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	622/1595	4.42	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	10	2	3.92	895/1533	3.92	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	764/1512	4.18	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.93	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	7	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4 15	1198/1568	4.15	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	908/1564	4.29	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.29	,		4.29	4.29	4.41	4.29
<del>-</del>	0	1	1	2	0	<i>5</i>		3.77	,			3.98	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	1	1	2	U	ь	4	3.77	907/1352	3.//	3.91	3.98	4.10	3.//
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	771/1384	4.08	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1092/1382	3.77	4.49	4.29	4.52	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	896/1368	4.15	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	4.95	4.35	4.80	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	3.36	3.68	3.87	4.25
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.81	3.68	3.83	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.92	****
J. Here there enough proceds for all the students	тт	4	U	J	J	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 110		T.00	3.23	3.34	

Title FIN DECISION-MAKING EN

Instructor: FENTON, ROBERT

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 857 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	13			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		#### - Means there are not enough						
				P	0		responses to b		be sig	oe significant				
				I	0	Other	11	_						
				?	0									

Course-Section: ENMG 672 8010 University of Maryland Title DECISION & RISK ANALYS

Baltimore County

Instructor: MACCARTHY, JOHN

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 9

Page 858 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollection	naira

Questions			NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.67
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	853/1595	4.22	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.22
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	935/1533	3.89	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.89
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.33
8. How mar	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1498/1646	4.11	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.11
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1145/1568	4.22	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	894/1572	4.78	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.00
l. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	987/1559	4.22	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.22
Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	3.91	3.98	4.10	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	953/1384	3.78	4.39	4.08	4.30	3.78		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1085/1368	3.78	4.43	4.30	4.56	3.78		
4. Were special techniques successful			0	4	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.00		
		Labora	tory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information			8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	***	4.43	4.12	4.61	****		
		Semina																
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme					8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention					8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned					8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear					8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****
o. Were ci	riteria i	ior grading mad	le cleai	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons				Туре				Majors		;				
 00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	2	A 3		Red	 guir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 5	2	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5						J						3 -		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				5	Under-q	rad	6	Non-	-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General							3				3		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1 F 0			Electives					0 #### - Means there				are not	enou	ſh	
			P 0										responses to be significant					
				I 0		Otl	ner					1	-		3			
				2 0														