

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 652 01
Title:	Mgmt,Leadership And Com
Instructor:	Gouker,Toby R

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	6	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	874/1520	4.62	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	723/1520	4.62	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	546/1291	4.67	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	493/1483	4.69	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	229/1417	4.75	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	334/1405	4.75	4.33	4.12	4.24	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	173/1504	4.67	4.45	4.16	4.21	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	801/1495	4.43	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	913/1459	4.69	4.49	4.47	4.48	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	864/1460	4.89	4.84	4.74	4.77	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	581/1455	4.69	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1094/1456	4.50	4.24	4.34	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	365/1316	4.61	4.36	4.03	3.86	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	471/1243	4.56	4.28	4.17	4.23	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1241	4.92	4.66	4.33	4.39	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	467/1236	4.85	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	324/889	4.58	4.20	4.02	4.06	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 652 01
Title:	Mgmt,Leadership And Com
Instructor:	Gouker,Toby R

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/24	4.67	4.67	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	4.60	4.60	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	4.83	4.83	4.07	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 652 02
Title:	Mgmt,Leadership And Com
Instructor:	Izenberg,Illysa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	84/1520	4.62	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	168/1520	4.62	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	194/1291	4.67	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	119/1483	4.69	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	106/1417	4.75	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	54/1405	4.75	4.33	4.12	4.24	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	384/1504	4.67	4.45	4.16	4.21	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	169/1495	4.43	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	119/1459	4.69	4.49	4.47	4.48	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1460	4.89	4.84	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	236/1455	4.69	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1456	4.50	4.24	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	132/1316	4.61	4.36	4.03	3.86	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	298/1243	4.56	4.28	4.17	4.23	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	100/1241	4.92	4.66	4.33	4.39	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1236	4.85	4.73	4.40	4.47	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	76/889	4.58	4.20	4.02	4.06	4.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 652 02
Title:	Mgmt,Leadership And Com
Instructor:	Izenberg,Illysa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	3.75	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	3.91	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	3.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	8/24	4.67	4.67	4.17	4.13	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	7/15	4.60	4.60	4.17	4.48	4.60
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	8/22	4.83	4.83	4.07	4.67	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 652 02
Title:	Mgmt,Leadership And Com
Instructor:	Izenberg,Illysa

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 3	A 13	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 11
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 668 01
Title:	Project and SE Managemen
Instructor:	Pavlak,Alex

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	778/1520	4.38	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1086/1520	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	713/1291	4.38	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	975/1483	4.08	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	5	2	3.69	1076/1417	3.69	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1002/1405	3.86	4.33	4.12	4.24	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	182/1504	4.77	4.45	4.16	4.21	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	891/1495	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	463/1459	4.75	4.49	4.47	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	727/1460	4.83	4.84	4.74	4.77	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	637/1455	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1015/1456	4.17	4.24	4.34	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	729/1316	4.00	4.36	4.03	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	530/1243	4.38	4.28	4.17	4.23	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	537/1241	4.54	4.66	4.33	4.39	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	554/1236	4.62	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	8	4	4.08	433/889	4.08	4.20	4.02	4.06	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 668 01
Title:	Project and SE Managemen
Instructor:	Pavlak,Alex

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	3.75	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	3.91	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	3.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/24	****	4.67	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.60	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.83	4.07	4.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 668 01
Title:	Project and SE Managemen
Instructor:	Pavlak,Alex

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 8 Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 6 Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 698 01
Title:	Engineering Management P
Instructor:	Pavlak,Alex

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	2	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1376/1520	3.57	4.33	4.31	4.39	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1218/1520	3.86	4.31	4.27	4.28	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1291	****	4.58	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1010/1483	4.00	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1348/1417	3.00	4.13	4.08	4.13	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	506/1405	4.40	4.33	4.12	4.24	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	803/1504	4.20	4.45	4.16	4.21	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	891/1495	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1230/1459	4.00	4.49	4.47	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	981/1460	4.71	4.84	4.74	4.77	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1203/1456	3.83	4.24	4.34	4.32	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	729/1316	4.00	4.36	4.03	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	660/1243	4.20	4.28	4.17	4.23	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	807/1241	4.20	4.66	4.33	4.39	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	341/1236	4.80	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	360/889	4.20	4.20	4.02	4.06	4.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 698 01
Title:	Engineering Management P
Instructor:	Pavlak,Alex

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	3.75	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	3.91	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	3.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	4.67	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.60	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	4.83	4.07	4.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 698 01
Title:	Engineering Management P
Instructor:	Pavlak,Alex

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 662 01
Title:	Fin Decision-Making Engr
Instructor:	Fenton,Robert E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	802/1520	4.36	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	874/1520	4.27	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	546/1291	4.50	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	636/1483	4.40	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	473/1417	4.40	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	687/1405	4.22	4.33	4.12	4.24	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	437/1504	4.50	4.45	4.16	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.92	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	891/1495	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1078/1459	4.27	4.49	4.47	4.48	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	779/1460	4.82	4.84	4.74	4.77	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	487/1455	4.64	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1094/1456	4.00	4.24	4.34	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	198/1316	4.67	4.36	4.03	3.86	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	876/1243	3.86	4.28	4.17	4.23	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1241	4.63	4.66	4.33	4.39	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1236	4.63	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	679/889	3.60	4.20	4.02	4.06	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 662 01
Title:	Fin Decision-Making Engr
Instructor:	Fenton,Robert E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	****	4.19	3.75	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	3.91	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	3.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	4.67	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	4.60	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	4.83	4.07	4.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 662 01
Title:	Fin Decision-Making Engr
Instructor:	Fenton,Robert E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 690 01
Title:	Innov & Tech Entrepreneur
Instructor:	Broedel Jr,Shel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	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	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	755/1520	4.40	4.33	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	584/1520	4.50	4.31	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1291	4.67	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	853/1483	4.20	4.34	4.23	4.25	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	659/1417	4.20	4.13	4.08	4.13	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.33	4.12	4.24	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1101/1504	3.90	4.45	4.16	4.21	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	1129/1519	4.50	4.92	4.70	4.77	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	891/1495	4.00	4.14	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	833/1459	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	544/1460	4.90	4.84	4.74	4.77	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	842/1455	4.33	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	746/1456	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.32	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	538/1316	4.25	4.36	4.03	3.86	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	732/1243	4.11	4.28	4.17	4.23	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	303/1241	4.78	4.66	4.33	4.39	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	544/1236	4.63	4.73	4.40	4.47	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	398/889	4.14	4.20	4.02	4.06	4.14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 690 01
Title:	Innov & Tech Entrepreneur
Instructor:	Broedel Jr,Shel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	3.66	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/165	****	****	4.19	3.75	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	3.91	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/158	****	****	4.36	3.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.71	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.52	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	4.67	4.17	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/15	****	4.60	4.17	4.48	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	4.83	4.07	4.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 690 01
Title:	Innov & Tech Entrepreneur
Instructor:	Broedel Jr, Shel

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.68	****

Frequency Distribution

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