

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 679
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	2	4	5	12	3.92	1229/1639	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.08	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	8	11	3.88	1274/1639	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	8	10	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	6	12	4.08	953/1583	3.94	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	7	5	5	3.26	1357/1532	3.30	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	4	6	4	3.25	1340/1504	3.35	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	3	13	4.04	1016/1612	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1235/1635	4.28	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	4	3	7	6	3.75	1170/1579	3.87	4.32	4.08	3.95	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	3	16	4.36	989/1518	4.42	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	0	5	17	4.36	1299/1520	4.47	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	7	8	3.68	1286/1517	3.74	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	8	9	3.76	1232/1550	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	413/1295	4.26	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	3	7	7	3.64	1052/1398	3.61	4.13	4.07	3.85	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	4	4	3	7	3.23	1286/1391	3.17	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	6	2	9	3.75	1095/1388	3.57	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	3	0	2	5	5	3.60	682/ 958	3.59	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 21	***					

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 679
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 680
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	2	4	5	12	3.92	1229/1639	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.08	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	8	11	3.88	1274/1639	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	8	10	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	6	12	4.08	953/1583	3.94	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	3	7	5	5	3.26	1357/1532	3.30	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	4	6	4	3.25	1340/1504	3.35	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	3	13	4.04	1016/1612	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1235/1635	4.28	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	691/1579	3.87	4.32	4.08	3.95	3.99	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	656/1518	4.42	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1188/1520	4.47	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1083/1517	3.74	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1177/1550	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	265/1295	4.26	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	3	7	7	3.64	1052/1398	3.61	4.13	4.07	3.85	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	4	4	3	7	3.23	1286/1391	3.17	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	6	2	9	3.75	1095/1388	3.57	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	3	0	2	5	5	3.60	682/ 958	3.59	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 680
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 681
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	0	1	2	6	6	8	3.78	1339/1639	3.87	4.41	4.27	4.08	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	1	9	6	6	3.65	1416/1639	3.80	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	8	7	7	3.87	1112/1397	3.96	4.34	4.28	4.18	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	2	2	0	7	6	6	3.67	1324/1583	3.94	4.28	4.19	4.01	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	2	9	4	5	3.36	1317/1532	3.30	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	8	9	3	3.55	1188/1504	3.35	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	8	5	8	3.91	1175/1612	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.10	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	2	1	9	9	4.05	1479/1635	4.28	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1257/1579	3.87	4.32	4.08	3.95	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	1077/1518	4.42	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	1	17	4.55	1158/1520	4.47	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	8	2	8	3.55	1332/1517	3.74	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	1	7	3	9	3.86	1188/1550	3.83	4.34	4.22	4.17	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	677/1295	4.26	4.18	3.94	3.84	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	5	5	5	3.56	1090/1398	3.61	4.13	4.07	3.85	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	5	0	6	3	4	3.06	1314/1391	3.17	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	6	3	4	4	3.22	1277/1388	3.57	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	690/ 958	3.59	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 681
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101H 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR SCI -HONORS
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 682
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	754/1639	4.40	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.22	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	363/1583	4.62	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	918/1532	3.89	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	3	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	747/1504	4.13	3.84	4.05	3.78	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	532/1612	4.47	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	2	11	6	4.21	1382/1635	4.21	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	680/1579	4.23	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	273/1520	4.95	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	907/1517	4.24	4.21	4.27	4.20	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	875/1550	4.29	4.34	4.22	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	6	2	12	4.30	421/1295	4.30	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	316/1398	4.68	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	847/1391	4.21	3.95	4.30	4.07	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	998/1388	3.94	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101H 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR SCI -HONORS
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 682
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 683
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	6	17	4.44	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	14	5	3.74	1363/1639	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	946/1397	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	10	4.11	929/1583	4.13	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1035/1532	3.77	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	1	11	4	3.65	1123/1504	3.63	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	913/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	1257/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	830/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	989/1518	4.56	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	872/1520	4.82	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	7	6	9	3.80	1241/1517	4.02	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	897/1550	4.30	4.34	4.22	4.17	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	5	5	8	3.52	968/1295	3.78	4.18	3.94	3.84	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	695/1398	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	4	10	6	3.71	1168/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	11	6	3.91	1025/1388	3.97	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	650/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.69	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 27 Non-major 27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
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 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 684
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	6	17	4.44	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	14	5	3.74	1363/1639	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	946/1397	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	10	4.11	929/1583	4.13	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1035/1532	3.77	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	1	11	4	3.65	1123/1504	3.63	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	913/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	1257/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	806/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.56	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.82	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1550	4.30	4.34	4.22	4.17	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1295	3.78	4.18	3.94	3.84	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	695/1398	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	4	10	6	3.71	1168/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	11	6	3.91	1025/1388	3.97	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	650/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.69	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 6	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 685
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	6	17	4.44	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	14	5	3.74	1363/1639	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.17	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	946/1397	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	11	10	4.11	929/1583	4.13	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1035/1532	3.77	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	2	1	11	4	3.65	1123/1504	3.63	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	10	10	4.16	913/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	1	13	10	4.38	1257/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	720/1518	4.56	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	4.82	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.21	4.27	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1550	4.30	4.34	4.22	4.17	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1295	3.78	4.18	3.94	3.84	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	695/1398	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	3	4	10	6	3.71	1168/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	4	11	6	3.91	1025/1388	3.97	4.03	4.28	4.01	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	650/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.69	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 6	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 686
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	2	12	15	4.45	698/1639	4.45	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	15	9	4.10	1014/1639	3.83	4.22	4.22	4.17	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	12	12	4.17	869/1397	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.18	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	14	10	4.17	871/1583	4.13	4.28	4.19	4.01	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	5	10	8	3.81	989/1532	3.77	3.87	4.01	3.88	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	7	5	6	8	3.58	1171/1504	3.63	3.84	4.05	3.78	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	9	9	3.82	1237/1612	4.08	4.33	4.16	4.10	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	14	13		4.48	1155/1635	4.40	4.52	4.65	4.56	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	702/1579	4.17	4.32	4.08	3.95	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	708/1518	4.56	4.62	4.43	4.38	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	1060/1520	4.82	4.79	4.70	4.61	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	10	14	4.28	864/1517	4.02	4.21	4.27	4.20	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	17	4.34	823/1550	4.30	4.34	4.22	4.17	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	4	5	15	4.04	609/1295	3.78	4.18	3.94	3.84	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	10	13	4.33	560/1398	4.21	4.13	4.07	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	5	9	12	4.19	871/1391	3.83	3.95	4.30	4.07	4.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	4	7	13	4.15	892/1388	3.97	4.03	4.28	4.01	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	2	3	10	8	4.04	448/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.04	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0102
 Title: INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 686
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	3	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 200 0101
 Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS
 Instructor: ROSENFELD, MICH
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 687
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	8	7	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	959/1639	4.16	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	785/1397	4.26	4.34	4.28	4.39	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	812/1583	4.24	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	6	6	3.79	1012/1532	3.79	3.87	4.01	4.09	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	544/1504	4.33	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	976/1612	4.11	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1215/1635	4.42	4.52	4.65	4.63	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1005/1579	3.93	4.32	4.08	4.14	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.62	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	943/1520	4.72	4.79	4.70	4.78	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	1016/1517	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.34	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	6	6	3.82	1204/1550	3.82	4.34	4.22	4.33	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	3	3	3	6	3.63	917/1295	3.63	4.18	3.94	4.07	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1398	4.44	4.13	4.07	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	662/1391	4.44	3.95	4.30	4.35	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	702/1388	4.44	4.03	4.28	4.37	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	424/ 958	4.13	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 2		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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	1	0	0	0	2	6	39	4.79	281/1639	4.79	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	33	4.65	360/1639	4.65	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	11	33	4.60	427/1397	4.60	4.34	4.28	4.39	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	1	3	12	17	4.17	871/1583	4.17	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	11	13	13	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.87	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	15	1	2	3	3	21	4.37	521/1504	4.37	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	14	31	4.63	352/1612	4.63	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	0	44	4.93	463/1635	4.93	4.52	4.65	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	7	29	4.76	175/1579	4.76	4.32	4.08	4.14	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	16	28	4.53	770/1518	4.53	4.62	4.43	4.48	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	43	4.91	491/1520	4.91	4.79	4.70	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	14	28	4.53	560/1517	4.53	4.21	4.27	4.34	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	7	35	4.69	435/1550	4.69	4.34	4.22	4.33	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	1	7	8	17	4.06	600/1295	4.06	4.18	3.94	4.07	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	****/1398	****	4.13	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/1391	****	3.95	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	****/1388	****	4.03	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	41	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.00	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ENES 220 0101
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 688
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	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	39				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0101
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 689
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	7	4.88	196/1639	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1639	4.92	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1583	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1532	4.56	3.87	4.01	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	585/1504	4.19	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1612	4.92	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.92	4.52	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.14	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.62	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.85	4.21	4.27	4.34	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1550	4.96	4.34	4.22	4.33	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	623/1295	4.56	4.18	3.94	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.13	4.07	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.03	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.02	3.93	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.78	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	31/ 53	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.28	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0101
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 690
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	7	4.88	196/1639	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1639	4.92	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1583	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.28	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1532	4.56	3.87	4.01	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	585/1504	4.19	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1612	4.92	4.33	4.16	4.21	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.92	4.52	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.14	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.62	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.85	4.21	4.27	4.34	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	4.96	4.34	4.22	4.33	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.56	4.18	3.94	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.13	4.07	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.03	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.02	3.93	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.04	4.78	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	31/ 53	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.28	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0102
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 691
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.92	4.22	4.22	4.27	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	4.75	4.28	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	4.56	3.87	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	4.19	3.84	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	4.92	4.33	4.16	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.92	4.52	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.32	4.08	4.14	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.62	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.85	4.21	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.96	4.34	4.22	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	4.56	4.18	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.33	5.00	

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	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						