

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: GRINER, ANITA E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 829
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	682/1576	4.48	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	838/1576	4.35	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	671/1342	4.43	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	4.30	805/1520	4.30	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	8	5	3.61	1208/1465	3.61	4.27	4.12	4.25	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	758/1434	4.18	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	11	6	3.83	1204/1547	3.83	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.95	
9. How would 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	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	624/1488	4.70	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	868/1493	4.77	4.90	4.73	4.80	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	778/1486	4.43	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	672/1489	4.52	4.49	4.32	4.38	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	404/1277	4.41	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	561/1279	4.39	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	620/1270	4.52	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	669/1269	4.48	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	2	1	6	12	4.18	405/ 878	4.18	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.18	
Laboratory															
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	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.81	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.69	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.82	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.39	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.96	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 16	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 9	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 14	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	4.92	136/1576	4.90	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1342	4.93	4.50	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1520	4.81	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	122/1465	4.73	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	110/1434	4.84	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	270/1547	4.81	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	124/1554	4.84	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1486	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	94/1277	4.57	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	234/1270	4.90	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.28	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.96	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	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	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 654 8051
 Title LEADING TEAMS AND ORG.
 Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 831
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1576	4.92	4.51	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1576	4.90	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	209/1342	4.93	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1520	4.81	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	335/1465	4.73	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	176/1434	4.84	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1547	4.81	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.84	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	560/1277	4.57	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1279	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	279/1270	4.90	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	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 criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences 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															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.67	4.60	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1112/1576	4.06	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1058/1576	4.13	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.50		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	929/1520	4.19	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	4.27	4.12	4.25	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	670/1434	4.27	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	718/1547	4.38	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.24	4.10	4.18	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	6	2	7	3.88	1324/1488	3.88	4.55	4.47	4.52	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.90	4.73	4.80	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	1168/1486	3.94	4.54	4.32	4.37	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	1169/1489	3.94	4.49	4.32	4.38	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.26	4.03	4.08	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute 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	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	612/1270	4.54	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	626/1269	4.54	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	766/ 878	3.27	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.27	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.96	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						