Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010

Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL

Instructor: GRINER, ANITA E

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 23

9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 829 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Ouestions			NTD	3.77	Fro	eque: 2	encies 3 4 5				tructor		e Dept		Level	Sect	
		Questions			NA				 -		Mean	Rank 	меан	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea:	
		General																
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course					0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48				4.30	4.43	4.4	
		ctor make clear th		0	0	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	838/1576		4.33	4.27	4.32	4.3	
		uestions reflect t		0	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	671/1342	4.43	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.4	
		uations reflect th		0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	805/1520	4.30	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.3	
. Did as	signed r	eadings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	8	5	3.61	1208/1465	3.61	4.27	4.12	4.25	3.6	
			te to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	758/1434	4.18	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.1	
. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly e	xplained	0	0	1	2	3	11	6	3.83	1204/1547	3.83	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.8	
. How ma	ny times	was class cancell	ed	0	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.9	
. How wo	uld you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	892/1554	4.06	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.0	
		Lecture																
Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	624/1488	4.70	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.7	
		ctor seem interest		1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	868/1493		4.90	4.73	4.80	4.7	
			nd explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	778/1486		4.54	4.32	4.37	4.4	
		es contribute to w		0	0	0	0	2	7		4.52	-,			4.32	4.38		
			ce your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	7		4.41			4.26		4.08		
. Diu au	.uiovisua	i teciniiques einian	ce your understanding	_	U		U	_	,	13	4.41	404/12//	4.41	4.20	4.03	4.00	4.5	
		Discussio																
. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	561/1279		4.66	4.17	4.34	4.3	
			raged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	620/1270	4.52	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.5	
. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage fai	r and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	669/1269	4.48	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.4	
4. Were special techniques successful				0	1	1	2	1	6	12	4.18	405/ 878	4.18	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.1	
		Laborator	v															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material				22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.47	4.23	4.36	***	
			background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240		3.81	4.35	4.37	***	
			le for lab activities	22	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 229		4.82	4.51	4.51	***	
	_	structor provide a		22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232		4.69	4.29	4.47	***	
			s clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 379		4.82	4.20	4.37	***	
		Seminar																
. Were c	riteria	for grading made c	lear	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.39	4.01	4.10	***	
			,															
. Did co	nference	Field Wor s help you carry o	k ut field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.96	4.03	4.10	5.0	
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1										, -						
Word t	horo ono	Self Pac ugh proctors for a		10	0	0	0	0	0	1 2	5.00	1/ 382	5 00	4.95	1 00	4.13	E (
. Wele t	nere eno	agii proceors for a	II the students	10	O	U	U	U	U	13	3.00	1/ 302	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.13	3.0	
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Re	ason	s			Ту	рe			Majors	3	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 16				ed f	 or M	 a i o r		2	 Graduat		 9	 Мајо		0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0			1/6/	dutt,	cu I	UL 11	۱۰۲ م		-	Graduat		,	ria J	J_	U	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0			Co	nera	1				5	Under-	rad 1	L4	Non	-major	1	
84-150	0	3.00-2.99			GEI	пста	_				J	onder-9	jiau i		NOII	a JUI	_	
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 7			רם.	ecti [.]	1760				0	#### -	Meane +	here -	are not	enous	rh	
orau.	J	3.30- 4 .00 /	P 0		E1(CCLI	v C D				J	respons					111	
			I 0		∩ +¹	ho~				1	.0	respons	LO LO L	JE BIGI	ıııdı	10		
			Ι 0		Other						. U							

? 0

Course-Section: ENMG 654 8050

Title LEADING TEAMS AND ORG.

Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 830 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Conoral																	
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course				0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	219/1576	4.92	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	0	0	1	11		136/1576	4.92	4.33	4.27	4.43	4.03	
		estions reflect the e		0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1342		4.50	4.32	4.38	5.00
		ations reflect the ex		0	0	0	0	0	2	10		179/1520	4.81	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.83
		adings contribute to		1	0	0	0	0	1	10		122/1465		4.27	4.12	4.25	4.91
		ignments contribute t		1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91		4.84	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.91
		system clearly expla		1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	270/1547	4.81	4.22	4.19		4.73
	-	was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574		4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00
		rade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1			124/1554			4.10		4.89
11		Lecture	,	0	0	0	•	0	•	1.0	F 00	1 /1 400	F 00	4 55	4 45	4 50	F 00
		ctor's lectures well		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.52	5.00
		tor seem interested i		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493		4.90	4.73	4.80	5.00
		erial presented and e		0	0	0	0	0		11	4.92		4.90	4.54		4.37	
		s contribute to what		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	U	U	U	U	Τ	11	4.92	94/1277	4.57	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.92
	Discussion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1279	4.94	4.66	4.17	4.34	5.00
		ts actively encourage		0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	234/1270	4.90	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.92
		tor encourage fair an		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.55	5.00
		chniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 878			4.05		5.00
		Seminar		_	_	•		•		_		4 4 000		4 00	4 0.1		
5. Were c	riteria i	or grading made clear	•	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 3/5	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	5.00
		Field Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry out f	ield activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.96	4.03	4.10	5.00
E 17 11		Self Paced	le e control d'acontrol	_	^	0	0	0	_	_	F 00	1 / 200	F 00	4 05	4 00	4 10	F 00
5. Were ti	nere enoug	gh proctors for all t	ne students	6	0	0	U	U	U	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	5.00
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
G		Company CD3	D				D -					m				NG	
Credits E	arnea	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					asons) 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	9	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-grad		3	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 11	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
			P 0							_	-	responses to be significant				ıt	
			I 0		Otl	ner				1	.1						
			3 0														

Course-Section: ENMG 654 8051

Title LEADING TEAMS AND ORG.

Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS

Enrollment:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 9 Questionnaires: 9

Page 831 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

						Frequencies				Instructor			Course Dep		UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1	L576	4.92	4.51	4.30	4.43	5.00
		tor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1			4.33	4.27	4.32	4.89
		estions reflect the		0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	209/1			4.50	4.32	4.38	4.86
	_	ations reflect the e	_	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1	L520		4.35	4.25	4.36	4.78
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	335/1	L465	4.73	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.56
		signments contribute		0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	176/1	L434	4.84	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.78
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1	L547	4.81	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.89
	-	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1	L574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1	L554	4.84	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.80
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1	L488	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.52	5.00
		ctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1	L493	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.80	5.00
		erial presented and		0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1	L486	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.89
		es contribute to what		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1	L489	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	560/1	L277	4.57	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.22
		Discussion																
1. Did cla	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1	1279	4.94	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate				0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1		4.90	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.89
		tor encourage fair a		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00		L269		4.81		4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful				0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/	878	5.00	4.28	4.05	4.11	5.00
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made clea	r	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	375	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	****
		Field Work																
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/	326	5.00	4.96	4.03	4.10	5.00
		Self Paced																
		system contribute to		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	40	****	3.67	4.60	4.50	****
3. Were ye	our conta	acts with the instruc	tor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****
5. Were the	here enou	igh proctors for all	the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	:				Тур	oe.			Majors	:
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Grad	duate	9	5	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4								2	TT7			4	37		4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0 3.00-3.49 2	C 0		Gei	nera	Т				3	Unde	er-gi	rad	4	Non-	major	4
84-150 Grad.	0 5	3.00-3.49 2 3.50-4.00 2	о о F 0		. וים	ecti					0	###1	4 _ 1	Means t	horo a	ro not	ono	rh
Grau.	5	3.50-4.00 2	P 0		E.T.	ECLI,	ves				U			means t es to b			_	ìTT
			I O		∩+1	her					6	rest	,O1126	a co L	e sign	ıııcalı	ıc	
			? 0		001						•							
			. 0															

Course-Section: ENMG 659 8010 Title

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT

Instructor: FENTON, ROBERT Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 832 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
On1																	
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	1	4	4	7	1 06	1112/1576	4.06	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.06
		ctor make clear th		0	0	0	1	2	7	6		1058/1576	4.13	4.33	4.27	4.43	4.13
		estions reflect t		0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50			4.50	4.32	4.38	4.50
		ations reflect th		0	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	, -	4.19	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.19
			to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	3			1166/1465		4.27	4.12	4.25	3.67
			te to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27			4.42	4.14	4.35	4.27
		signments contilibuted system clearly experiences and system clearly experiences are supplied to the system of the		0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	718/1547		4.22	4.19	4.24	4.38
		was class cancell	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574		4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00
			teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	6			1227/1554					
		,															
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures w		0	0	1	0	6	2	7		1324/1488	3.88	4.55	4.47	4.52	3.88
		tor seem interest		0	0	0	0	1	2			908/1493		4.90	4.73	4.80	4.75
			nd explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	4	7		1168/1486	3.94	4.54		4.37	
		es contribute to w		0	0	1	2	2	3	8		1169/1489	3.94	4.49	4.32	4.38	3.94
5. Did	audiovisual	. techniques enhan	ce your understanding	1	1	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.26	4.03	4.08	3.50
		Discussion	n														
1 Did	alace dieas		to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	488/1279	4.46	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.46
			raged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54		4.54	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.54
			r and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	. ,	4.54	4.81	4.35		4.54
		chniques successf		3	2	2	2	2	1		3.27					4.11	
I. WCI	c special co	ciniiques successi	u i	3	2	2		2	_	-	3.27	7007 070	3.27	1.20	1.05	1.11	3.27
		Seminar															
5. Were	e criteria f	for grading made c	lear	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	5.00
		m/ -14 m	I-														
E Did	aonforonaoa	Field Wor	к ut field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	E 00	1 06	4 02	4.10	E 00
5. DIG	conterences	s help you carry o	ut lield activities	12	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/ 320	5.00	4.90	4.03	4.10	5.00
		Self Pac	ed														
5. Were	e there enou	igh proctors for a	ll the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	5.00
			Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credita	s Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 11		Per		ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		7	Majo		0
28-55		1.00-1.99 0			1/6/	101I	cu I	J⊥ 14C	בטני.	D	U	Graduati	_	,	Ma JC	<i>,</i> _	U
56-83		2.00-2.99 0			Ger	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	8
84-15		3.00-3.49 2			001	a	_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		•
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 2			Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
			P 0									#### - Means there are not encresponses to be significant				_	
			I 0		Otl	her					6						
			? 0														