

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 638
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	5	4.30	780/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	661/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	624/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	807/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1114/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1145/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	909/1459	3.98	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1260/1480	4.26	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	334/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	762/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	683/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	442/1179	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	674/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	978/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	860/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	358/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 4	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 2	General	0 Under-grad 10 Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 F 0	Electives	0
			0 P 0		
			0 I 0		
			1 ? 1	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 639
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	5	4.30	780/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	661/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	624/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	807/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1114/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	1145/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	909/1459	3.98	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1260/1480	4.26	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	334/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	674/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	978/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	860/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	358/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 640
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	1291/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	758/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	953/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1298/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	2	4	3	3.13	1255/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1039/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	961/1459	3.98	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	1	4.00	1349/1480	4.26	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1089/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	1104/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1031/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	7	4	3.80	1145/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1204/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	760/1179	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	4	3	1	3.18	1100/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1088/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	3	1	4	3	3.64	1076/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	650/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0103
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 641
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	4	6	4	3.75	1254/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	1	6	3.63	1275/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1046/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1218/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	5	1	2.93	1317/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	5	3	3	3.36	1180/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1272/1459	3.98	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1044/1480	4.26	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	5	0	3	3.27	1301/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1277/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	1107/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	2	5	3.47	1246/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1176/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	914/1179	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	829/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	809/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	967/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	640/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0103
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 641
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENES 101 0104
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 642
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1069/1481	4.01	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	967/1481	4.16	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	810/1249	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	840/1424	3.93	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	985/1396	3.32	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	934/1342	3.55	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	775/1459	3.98	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1107/1480	4.26	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	702/1450	4.04	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	559/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	963/1407	4.64	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	753/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1081/1400	3.90	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	365/1179	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	944/1262	3.78	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	708/1259	3.98	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	984/1256	3.93	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	501/ 788	3.79	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	116/ 246	4.33	4.26	4.20	3.93	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	136/ 249	4.17	4.08	4.11	3.95	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	159/ 242	4.33	4.45	4.40	4.33	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	195/ 240	3.67	4.37	4.20	4.20	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	81/ 217	4.40	4.42	4.04	4.02	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0104
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 642
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	4	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 110 0101
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 643
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	0	1	0	1	10	9	4.24	870/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	963/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	824/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1061/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	8	4	6	3.74	934/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	214/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	436/1459	4.39	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	702/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	2	10	3	3.67	1160/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	990/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	1238/1407	4.21	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1096/1399	3.65	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1017/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	549/1179	3.96	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	0	3	7	3.71	907/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	1	1	5	3	3.14	1154/1259	2.74	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	0	2	3	4	3.23	1147/1256	2.77	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	3.33	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 110 0102
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 644
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	5	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1286/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	4	4	4.10	854/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	959/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	643/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	672/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	800/1459	4.39	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	729/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1299/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1152/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1268/1407	4.21	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1250/1399	3.65	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1287/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	853/1179	3.96	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	708/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1190/1259	2.74	4.40	4.29	4.06	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	1	2	2.75	1206/1256	2.77	4.34	4.30	4.08	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	671/ 788	3.33	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 110 0103
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 645
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	1	4.25	844/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	822/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	742/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1459	4.39	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1160/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.67	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1107/1407	4.21	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	828/1399	3.65	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	591/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	3.96	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.67	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1257/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	3.77	1.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	1256/1259	2.74	4.40	4.29	4.06	1.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1238/1256	2.77	4.34	4.30	4.08	2.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENES 110 0104
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 646
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	5	4.27	818/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	726/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1138/1424	4.02	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	801/1396	3.68	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	542/1342	4.38	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	413/1459	4.39	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.92	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	3	0	3.33	1285/1450	3.49	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1019/1409	4.33	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	1	2	5	3.82	1337/1407	4.21	4.77	4.69	4.57	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	1325/1399	3.65	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1243/1400	3.79	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	934/1179	3.96	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1146/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1120/1259	2.74	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1200/1256	2.77	4.34	4.30	4.08	2.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 2
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 2
					Other 7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 200 0102
 Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS
 Instructor: ONEILL, MARTIN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 647
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	3	5	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1286/1481	3.60	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1071/1249	3.70	4.37	4.27	4.36	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	908/1424	4.10	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1368/1396	2.50	4.07	3.98	3.94	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	695/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	732/1459	4.30	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1014/1450	3.86	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	514/1409	4.70	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	783/1399	4.30	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	985/1400	4.10	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	404/1179	4.30	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	570/1262	4.25	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENES 200 0102
 Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS
 Instructor: ONEILL, MARTIN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 647
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 221 0101
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 648
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	5	6	3.89	1174/1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	9	2	3.61	1280/1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	4	2	2.83	1210/1249	2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	1	5	1	3.56	1258/1424	3.53	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1114/1396	3.72	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1018/1342	3.60	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	8	3	3.39	1303/1459	3.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	5	3	1	2.92	1379/1450	3.01	4.10	4.09	4.15	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	8	4	4	3.59	1283/1409	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	1176/1407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	4	4	2	3.00	1325/1399	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	6	2	2	2.76	1347/1400	2.69	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	8	1	1	3.08	1136/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1123/1259	3.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1106/1256	3.42	4.34	4.30	4.28	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 788	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 15

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 221 0101
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 649
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	5	6	3.89	1174/1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	9	2	3.61	1280/1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	4	2	2.83	1210/1249	2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	2	1	5	1	3.56	1258/1424	3.53	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1114/1396	3.72	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1018/1342	3.60	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	8	3	3.39	1303/1459	3.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1450	3.01	4.10	4.09	4.15	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1281/1409	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1296/1407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1357/1399	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.29	2.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1389/1400	2.69	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	8	1	1	3.08	1136/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1123/1259	3.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	2	3	3.50	1106/1256	3.42	4.34	4.30	4.28	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 788	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 221 0102
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 650
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	928/1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1397/1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	2	1	2	2.64	1227/1249	2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	1	0	1	3	3.00	1361/1424	3.53	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1083/1396	3.72	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.60	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1117/1459	3.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1133/1480	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1343/1450	3.01	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1001/1409	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1031/1407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1260/1399	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	0	3	3	3.20	1291/1400	2.69	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	1188/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	4.11	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1142/1259	3.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1195/1256	3.42	4.34	4.30	4.28	2.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	781/ 788	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	1	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 221 0103
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 651
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	3	1	4.00	1069/1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1394/1481	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1212/1249	2.78	4.37	4.27	4.36	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	959/1424	3.53	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1396	3.72	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	755/1342	3.60	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1348/1459	3.45	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	839/1480	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.01	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.62	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.45	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1260/1399	3.15	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1356/1400	2.69	4.35	4.27	4.34	2.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.00	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1092/1262	3.05	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1127/1259	3.38	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1025/1256	3.42	4.34	4.30	4.28	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	2.00	4.03	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENES 221 0103
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 651
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	4				
				?	0						