

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 750
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	10	12	4.42	720/1522	4.20	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	7	10	4.13	1006/1522	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	833/1285	4.16	4.12	4.30	4.36	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	6	10	3.96	1068/1476	4.00	4.03	4.22	4.20	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	5	1	8	2	3	2.84	1357/1412	2.89	3.44	4.06	4.00	2.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	5	8	5	3.67	1097/1381	3.50	3.91	4.08	3.97	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	1	7	12	4.13	903/1500	4.22	4.06	4.18	4.20	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	932/1517	4.72	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	859/1497	4.21	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	798/1440	4.55	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	859/1448	4.65	4.56	4.71	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	793/1436	4.38	4.06	4.29	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	5	12	4.04	1018/1432	4.06	3.97	4.29	4.31	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	5	3	11	4.00	606/1221	4.16	3.77	3.93	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	553/1280	4.18	3.53	4.10	4.08	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	819/1277	4.31	3.75	4.34	4.33	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	756/1269	4.22	3.94	4.31	4.33	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	12	6	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	391/ 854	4.40	3.72	4.02	4.00	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	2	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	131/ 215	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.62	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	2	0	0	2	6	4.00	178/ 228	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.56	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	159/ 217	4.45	4.35	4.51	4.57	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	158/ 216	4.54	4.43	4.42	4.72	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	3	0	1	0	6	3.60	181/ 205	3.94	4.25	4.23	4.37	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	23

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 751
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	2	6	7	3.94	1180/1522	4.20	4.11	4.30	4.34	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1016/1522	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	873/1285	4.16	4.12	4.30	4.36	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.03	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	3	2	4	2.76	1366/1412	2.89	3.44	4.06	4.00	2.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1108/1381	3.50	3.91	4.08	3.97	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	988/1500	4.22	4.06	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	891/1517	4.72	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	833/1497	4.21	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	891/1440	4.55	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	1215/1448	4.65	4.56	4.71	4.78	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	751/1436	4.38	4.06	4.29	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	7	6	3.94	1099/1432	4.06	3.97	4.29	4.31	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	606/1221	4.16	3.77	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	874/1280	4.18	3.53	4.10	4.08	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	849/1277	4.31	3.75	4.34	4.33	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	875/1269	4.22	3.94	4.31	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.40	3.72	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	54/ 215	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.62	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	73/ 228	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.56	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	108/ 217	4.45	4.35	4.51	4.57	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	49/ 216	4.54	4.43	4.42	4.72	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	104/ 205	3.94	4.25	4.23	4.37	4.29	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15

Course-Section: ENME 204 0103
 Title INTR0 ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: SPENCE, ANNE M
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 752
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	929/1522	4.20	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	8	9	4.09	1032/1522	4.11	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	817/1285	4.16	4.12	4.30	4.36	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	987/1476	4.00	4.03	4.22	4.20	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	4	3	1	6	3	3.06	1323/1412	2.89	3.44	4.06	4.00	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	3	5	3	6	3.19	1258/1381	3.50	3.91	4.08	3.97	3.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	463/1500	4.22	4.06	4.18	4.20	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	749/1517	4.72	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	421/1497	4.21	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	532/1440	4.55	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	840/1448	4.65	4.56	4.71	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	696/1436	4.38	4.06	4.29	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	12	4.20	928/1432	4.06	3.97	4.29	4.31	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	303/1221	4.16	3.77	3.93	4.02	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	442/1280	4.18	3.53	4.10	4.08	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	594/1277	4.31	3.75	4.34	4.33	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	692/1269	4.22	3.94	4.31	4.33	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	141/ 854	4.40	3.72	4.02	4.00	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 215	4.48	4.42	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 228	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	****/ 217	4.45	4.35	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 216	4.54	4.43	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 205	3.94	4.25	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	19

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 217 0101
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 753
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	889/1522	3.84	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	432/1522	3.98	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	650/1285	4.03	4.12	4.30	4.36	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	815/1476	3.83	4.03	4.22	4.20	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1127/1412	3.46	3.44	4.06	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	233/1381	3.89	3.91	4.08	3.97	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	680/1500	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.20	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	674/1497	3.78	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1440	4.33	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448	4.39	4.56	4.71	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	865/1436	3.88	4.06	4.29	4.29	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	1036/1432	3.76	3.97	4.29	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	351/1221	4.13	3.77	3.93	4.02	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	854/1280	3.14	3.53	4.10	4.08	3.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	819/1277	3.61	3.75	4.34	4.33	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	943/1269	3.30	3.94	4.31	4.33	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	369/ 854	3.48	3.72	4.02	4.00	4.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	980/1522	3.84	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1016/1522	3.98	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	873/1285	4.03	4.12	4.30	4.36	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	4	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	1103/1476	3.83	4.03	4.22	4.20	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	7	0	1	5	4	0	3.30	1272/1412	3.46	3.44	4.06	4.00	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	5	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1046/1381	3.89	3.91	4.08	3.97	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	0	8	4	5	3.82	1135/1500	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.20	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	532/1517	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.63	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	718/1497	3.78	3.97	4.11	4.11	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	774/1440	4.33	4.37	4.45	4.42	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	954/1448	4.39	4.56	4.71	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1056/1436	3.88	4.06	4.29	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	6	4	6	3.82	1161/1432	3.76	3.97	4.29	4.31	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	6	3	4	3.85	733/1221	4.13	3.77	3.93	4.02	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	3	7	2	3.47	1051/1280	3.14	3.53	4.10	4.08	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	692/1277	3.61	3.75	4.34	4.33	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1053/1269	3.30	3.94	4.31	4.33	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	426/ 854	3.48	3.72	4.02	4.00	4.00

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	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 29 Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 1	Other 15	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 217 0201
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 755
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	3	9	5	3	3.09	1482/1522	3.84	4.11	4.30	4.34	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	10	7	2	3.22	1454/1522	3.98	4.09	4.26	4.29	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	9	4	3.57	1149/1285	4.03	4.12	4.30	4.36	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1363/1476	3.83	4.03	4.22	4.20	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	7	9	2	3.50	1165/1412	3.46	3.44	4.06	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	3	0	2	6	2	3.31	1240/1381	3.89	3.91	4.08	3.97	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	7	5	5	3.30	1388/1500	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.20	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1517	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	3	8	5	1	2.90	1438/1497	3.78	3.97	4.11	4.11	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	4	4	4	8	3.67	1331/1440	4.33	4.37	4.45	4.42	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	1	4	9	5	3.67	1411/1448	4.39	4.56	4.71	4.78	3.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	7	3	6	3.38	1320/1436	3.88	4.06	4.29	4.29	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	0	4	7	5	3.45	1287/1432	3.76	3.97	4.29	4.31	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	13	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/1221	4.13	3.77	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	11	2	1	3	2	2.11	1272/1280	3.14	3.53	4.10	4.08	2.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	7	6	2	3	1	2.21	1273/1277	3.61	3.75	4.34	4.33	2.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	8	4	3	2	2	2.26	1261/1269	3.30	3.94	4.31	4.33	2.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	4	3	2	1	1	2.27	846/ 854	3.48	3.72	4.02	4.00	2.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 217 0202
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 756
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1522	3.84	4.11	4.30	4.34	****	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1522	3.98	4.09	4.26	4.29	****	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	4.03	4.12	4.30	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1476	3.83	4.03	4.22	4.20	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	3.46	3.44	4.06	4.00	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1500	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.20	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.63	****	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1497	3.78	3.97	4.11	4.11	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1440	4.33	4.37	4.45	4.42	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1448	4.39	4.56	4.71	4.78	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1436	3.88	4.06	4.29	4.29	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1432	3.76	3.97	4.29	4.31	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1280	3.14	3.53	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	3.61	3.75	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	3.30	3.94	4.31	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 757
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4	6	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	769/1476	4.27	4.03	4.22	4.26	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1122/1412	3.58	3.44	4.06	4.03	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	806/1381	4.00	3.91	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.06	4.18	4.13	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1239/1497	3.60	3.97	4.11	4.13	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	751/1440	4.55	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1343/1448	4.09	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	942/1436	4.18	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1305/1432	3.40	3.97	4.29	4.29	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	3	0	6	3.82	752/1221	3.82	3.77	3.93	3.94	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.53	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1277	4.17	3.75	4.34	4.38	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	828/1269	4.17	3.94	4.31	4.39	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	588/ 854	3.75	3.72	4.02	4.00	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	188/ 215	3.75	4.42	4.36	4.21	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	45/ 228	4.75	4.26	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	71/ 217	4.75	4.35	4.51	4.45	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	154/ 216	4.25	4.43	4.42	4.35	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 205	****	4.25	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0 Under-grad 14 Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 758
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	7	9	4.28	879/1522	4.41	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	5	7	3	3.53	1356/1522	3.90	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	6	4	3.56	1151/1285	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	473/1476	4.60	4.03	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	8	3	2	3.06	1323/1412	3.36	3.44	4.06	4.03	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	2	5	5	3.67	1097/1381	3.89	3.91	4.08	4.13	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1141/1500	4.18	4.06	4.18	4.13	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	802/1517	4.78	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	7	3	4	3.67	1204/1497	4.08	3.97	4.11	4.13	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	798/1440	4.40	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.87	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1117/1436	4.07	4.06	4.29	4.30	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	1013/1432	4.08	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	739/1221	3.83	3.77	3.93	3.94	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	5	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	18	Non-major
					7
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 304 0201
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 759
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	6	4.55	559/1522	4.41	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	854/1522	3.90	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1027/1285	3.73	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	285/1476	4.60	4.03	4.22	4.26	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1077/1412	3.36	3.44	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	743/1381	3.89	3.91	4.08	4.13	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	444/1500	4.18	4.06	4.18	4.13	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	691/1517	4.78	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	385/1497	4.08	3.97	4.11	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1007/1440	4.40	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	765/1448	4.87	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	934/1436	4.07	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	991/1432	4.08	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1221	3.83	3.77	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101
 Title FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 760
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	8	6	1	3.10	1481/1522	3.10	4.11	4.30	4.34	3.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	8	7	2	3.42	1396/1522	3.42	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	11	4	3.80	1065/1285	3.80	4.12	4.30	4.30	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	7	5	2	2	2.72	1451/1476	2.72	4.03	4.22	4.26	2.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	3	7	3	3.50	1165/1412	3.50	3.44	4.06	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	6	3	2	4	2	2.59	1347/1381	2.59	3.91	4.08	4.13	2.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	882/1500	4.16	4.06	4.18	4.13	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	292/1517	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	7	9	0	0	2.25	1484/1497	2.25	3.97	4.11	4.13	2.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	2	7	7	3.80	1287/1440	3.80	4.37	4.45	4.46	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	10	6	4.00	1353/1448	4.00	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	4	10	2	0	2.50	1419/1436	2.50	4.06	4.29	4.30	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	8	2	1	2.50	1402/1432	2.50	3.97	4.29	4.29	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	4	6	6	2	3.10	1053/1221	3.10	3.77	3.93	3.94	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	0	3	0	2.67	1250/1280	2.67	3.53	4.10	4.14	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1249/1277	2.83	3.75	4.34	4.38	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	4	0	0	2.33	1258/1269	2.33	3.94	4.31	4.39	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 215	****	4.42	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.26	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.35	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	4.43	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 205	****	4.25	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	19	
?	2			

Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	8	17	21	4.17	991/1522	4.17	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	20	23	4.38	726/1522	4.38	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	5	13	27	4.41	638/1285	4.41	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	2	5	11	9	16	3.74	1202/1476	3.74	4.03	4.22	4.26	3.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	15	2	2	8	10	10	3.75	1013/1412	3.75	3.44	4.06	4.03	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	4	9	15	14	3.86	969/1381	3.86	3.91	4.08	4.13	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	7	13	25	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.06	4.18	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	9	38	4.81	714/1517	4.81	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	12	16	11	3.92	1006/1497	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.13	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	8	34	4.63	643/1440	4.63	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	10	36	4.74	878/1448	4.74	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	7	18	22	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	13	27	4.32	838/1432	4.32	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	2	1	10	7	20	4.05	589/1221	4.05	3.77	3.93	3.94	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	46	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	46	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 9	C 6	General	0
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 10	D 0	Under-grad	50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	41

Course-Section: ENME 332H 0101
 Title SOLID MECH & MAT LAB H
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 762
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	197/1522	4.88	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.88	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	660/1476	4.38	4.03	4.22	4.26	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.44	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	233/1381	4.63	3.91	4.08	4.13	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1366/1500	3.38	4.06	4.18	4.13	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	125/1497	4.86	3.97	4.11	4.13	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.88	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.56	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	350/1432	4.75	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	124/1221	4.75	3.77	3.93	3.94	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	54/ 215	4.71	4.42	4.36	4.21	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	53/ 228	4.71	4.26	4.35	4.29	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	108/ 217	4.57	4.35	4.51	4.45	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	49/ 216	4.86	4.43	4.42	4.35	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	104/ 205	4.29	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.29	

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	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 763
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1522	4.56	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	299/1522	4.39	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1285	4.44	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	913/1476	4.38	4.03	4.22	4.26	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	760/1412	3.45	3.44	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	575/1381	4.41	3.91	4.08	4.13	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	750/1500	4.13	4.06	4.18	4.13	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	4.84	4.78	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1497	4.79	3.97	4.11	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.78	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.88	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1436	4.72	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	454/1432	4.72	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	524/1221	4.59	3.77	3.93	3.94	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	63/ 215	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.21	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	69/ 228	4.39	4.26	4.35	4.29	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/ 217	4.36	4.35	4.51	4.45	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	106/ 216	4.63	4.43	4.42	4.35	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	118/ 205	4.33	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 764
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1522	4.56	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	824/1522	4.39	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	938/1285	4.44	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	473/1476	4.38	4.03	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1379/1412	3.45	3.44	4.06	4.03	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	247/1381	4.41	3.91	4.08	4.13	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	387/1500	4.13	4.06	4.18	4.13	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	901/1517	4.84	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	104/1497	4.79	3.97	4.11	4.13	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	565/1440	4.78	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1448	4.88	4.56	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	383/1436	4.72	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	418/1432	4.72	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	213/1221	4.59	3.77	3.93	3.94	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	116/ 215	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.21	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	154/ 228	4.39	4.26	4.35	4.29	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	98/ 217	4.36	4.35	4.51	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	100/ 216	4.63	4.43	4.42	4.35	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	135/ 205	4.33	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	3.33	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 2
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 10

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0104
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 765
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	4.17	991/1522	4.56	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	965/1522	4.39	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	531/1285	4.44	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	473/1476	4.38	4.03	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1013/1412	3.45	3.44	4.06	4.03	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	519/1381	4.41	3.91	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1298/1500	4.13	4.06	4.18	4.13	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	645/1517	4.84	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	147/1497	4.79	3.97	4.11	4.13	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.78	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.88	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.72	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.72	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1221	4.59	3.77	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	121/ 215	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.21	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	135/ 228	4.39	4.26	4.35	4.29	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	208/ 217	4.36	4.35	4.51	4.45	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	90/ 216	4.63	4.43	4.42	4.35	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	46/ 205	4.33	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.67	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 360 0101
 Title VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 766
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	1	4	11	13	4.24	909/1522	4.24	4.11	4.30	4.34	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	16	4.48	576/1522	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	19	4.48	554/1285	4.48	4.12	4.30	4.30	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	7	12	7	3.86	1150/1476	3.86	4.03	4.22	4.26	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	671/1412	4.13	3.44	4.06	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	0	9	5	9	3.65	1103/1381	3.65	3.91	4.08	4.13	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	7	13	4.14	892/1500	4.14	4.06	4.18	4.13	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	577/1517	4.86	4.78	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	17	4	4.04	872/1497	4.04	3.97	4.11	4.13	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	824/1440	4.48	4.37	4.45	4.46	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	629/1448	4.85	4.56	4.71	4.71	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	14	8	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	6	15	4.19	935/1432	4.19	3.97	4.29	4.29	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	19	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1221	****	3.77	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General	0
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 767
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1489/1522	3.00	4.11	4.30	4.42	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	0	3.25	1442/1522	3.25	4.09	4.26	4.34	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1088/1285	3.75	4.12	4.30	4.42	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	0	3	0	3.00	1416/1476	3.00	4.03	4.22	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1243/1381	3.29	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.06	4.18	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1019/1517	4.57	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1446/1497	2.83	3.97	4.11	4.21	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1423/1440	2.71	4.37	4.45	4.52	2.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1446/1448	2.86	4.56	4.71	4.75	2.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	1425/1436	2.29	4.06	4.29	4.32	2.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	0	3	0	2.43	1406/1432	2.43	3.97	4.29	4.34	2.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1221	****	3.77	3.93	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.49	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.26	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.35	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.43	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.25	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 767
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 423 0101
 Title HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN
 Instructor: FISHER, JESSE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 768
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	12	4.65	453/1522	4.65	4.11	4.30	4.42	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	477/1522	4.56	4.09	4.26	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.12	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	197/1476	4.79	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1037/1412	3.73	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	458/1381	4.38	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.06	4.18	4.25	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1062/1517	4.53	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	643/1497	4.27	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	1106/1440	4.18	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	954/1448	4.71	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	942/1436	4.19	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	669/1432	4.47	3.97	4.29	4.34	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	556/1221	4.13	3.77	3.93	4.04	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	4.40	3.53	4.10	4.28	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1269	4.60	3.94	4.31	4.49	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.42	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.26	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.35	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.43	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.25	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	Under-grad 17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Non-major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	9
?	0		

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 769
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	4	4.25	899/1522	4.19	4.11	4.30	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	407/1522	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.34	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	706/1285	4.08	4.12	4.30	4.42	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	597/1476	4.36	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1412	4.00	3.44	4.06	4.11	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	174/1381	4.33	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	660/1500	3.92	4.06	4.18	4.25	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.78	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	481/1497	4.30	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	656/1440	4.63	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1157/1448	4.58	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	457/1436	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	632/1432	4.08	3.97	4.29	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	461/1221	3.53	3.77	3.93	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.17	3.53	4.10	4.28	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1214/1277	3.17	3.75	4.34	4.50	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	586/1269	4.25	3.94	4.31	4.49	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 215	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.47	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	69/ 228	4.22	4.26	4.35	4.32	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/ 217	4.38	4.35	4.51	4.55	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	141/ 216	4.52	4.43	4.42	4.20	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	86/ 205	4.29	4.25	4.23	3.85	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 769
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 770
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	4	3.88	1234/1522	4.19	4.11	4.30	4.42	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1206/1522	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.34	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1053/1285	4.08	4.12	4.30	4.42	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	913/1476	4.36	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1077/1412	4.00	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	806/1381	4.33	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1396/1500	3.92	4.06	4.18	4.25	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	873/1517	4.90	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1057/1497	4.30	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	798/1440	4.63	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1048/1448	4.58	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	987/1436	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1236/1432	4.08	3.97	4.29	4.34	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1043/1221	3.53	3.77	3.93	4.04	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	3.17	3.53	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	3.17	3.75	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	4.25	3.94	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	168/ 215	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.47	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	217/ 228	4.22	4.26	4.35	4.32	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	189/ 217	4.38	4.35	4.51	4.55	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	121/ 216	4.52	4.43	4.42	4.20	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	168/ 205	4.29	4.25	4.23	3.85	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 771
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	4	4.44	681/1522	4.19	4.11	4.30	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	639/1522	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	4.08	4.12	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	473/1476	4.36	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1412	4.00	3.44	4.06	4.11	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	575/1381	4.33	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	892/1500	3.92	4.06	4.18	4.25	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.78	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.30	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	452/1440	4.63	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1048/1448	4.58	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	977/1432	4.08	3.97	4.29	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1028/1221	3.53	3.77	3.93	4.04	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1106/1280	3.17	3.53	4.10	4.28	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1183/1277	3.17	3.75	4.34	4.50	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	875/1269	4.25	3.94	4.31	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	63/ 215	4.49	4.42	4.36	4.47	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	61/ 228	4.22	4.26	4.35	4.32	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	159/ 217	4.38	4.35	4.51	4.55	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	90/ 216	4.52	4.43	4.42	4.20	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	46/ 205	4.29	4.25	4.23	3.85	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 772
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	2	2	4	0	2.29	1515/1522	2.29	4.11	4.30	4.42	2.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	5	0	3.14	1467/1522	3.14	4.09	4.26	4.34	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	2	4	3	3.29	1218/1285	3.29	4.12	4.30	4.42	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1408/1476	3.11	4.03	4.22	4.31	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	4	1	0	1	0	1.67	1408/1412	1.67	3.44	4.06	4.11	1.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	0	3	3	0	2.88	1320/1381	2.88	3.91	4.08	4.21	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	2	5	4	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.06	4.18	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	2	0	0	0	11	4.38	1177/1517	4.38	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	3	8	0	0	2.46	1478/1497	2.46	3.97	4.11	4.21	2.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	0	1	4	5	3.62	1342/1440	3.62	4.37	4.45	4.52	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	4	4	1	2	2.77	1447/1448	2.77	4.56	4.71	4.75	2.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	5	2	1	2.62	1415/1436	2.62	4.06	4.29	4.32	2.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	1	5	1	1	2.38	1408/1432	2.38	3.97	4.29	4.34	2.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2.82	1119/1221	2.82	3.77	3.93	4.04	2.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	0	0	0	0	1.00	1277/1280	1.00	3.53	4.10	4.28	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1275/1277	1.50	3.75	4.34	4.50	1.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1265/1269	2.00	3.94	4.31	4.49	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 471 0101
 Title COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI
 Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 773
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	350/1522	4.73	4.11	4.30	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	607/1522	4.47	4.09	4.26	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.12	4.30	4.42	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1219/1412	3.42	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	575/1381	4.29	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	750/1500	4.29	4.06	4.18	4.25	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	602/1497	4.30	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	532/1440	4.71	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.56	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	514/1436	4.57	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	632/1432	4.50	3.97	4.29	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	508/1221	4.18	3.77	3.93	4.04	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	718/1280	4.00	3.53	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1277	4.17	3.75	4.34	4.50	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	828/1269	4.17	3.94	4.31	4.49	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.42	4.36	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 228	4.80	4.26	4.35	4.32	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	102/ 217	4.60	4.35	4.51	4.55	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	106/ 216	4.60	4.43	4.42	4.20	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	4.25	4.23	3.85	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 774
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	8	2	3.69	1329/1522	3.64	4.11	4.30	4.42	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1206/1522	3.52	4.09	4.26	4.34	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1053/1285	3.51	4.12	4.30	4.42	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1103/1476	3.56	4.03	4.22	4.31	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1225/1412	3.40	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	1	4	5	3.85	984/1381	3.63	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	988/1500	3.63	4.06	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	749/1517	4.81	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1126/1497	3.62	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1094/1440	4.06	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	1190/1448	4.44	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1024/1436	3.62	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	8	4	3.93	1108/1432	3.17	3.97	4.29	4.34	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	4	1	0	2	2	2.67	1148/1221	2.72	3.77	3.93	4.04	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	131/ 215	4.03	4.42	4.36	4.47	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	220/ 228	3.50	4.26	4.35	4.32	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	189/ 217	4.20	4.35	4.51	4.55	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	216/ 216	3.38	4.43	4.42	4.20	2.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	141/ 205	4.00	4.25	4.23	3.85	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 775
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	4	2	3.58	1372/1522	3.64	4.11	4.30	4.42	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	1	3.17	1464/1522	3.52	4.09	4.26	4.34	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1236/1285	3.51	4.12	4.30	4.42	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	5	0	3.20	1391/1476	3.56	4.03	4.22	4.31	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1412	3.40	3.44	4.06	4.11	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	3.42	1193/1381	3.63	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	3.25	1396/1500	3.63	4.06	4.18	4.25	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	645/1517	4.81	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1301/1497	3.62	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1245/1440	4.06	4.37	4.45	4.52	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	1232/1448	4.44	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	1364/1436	3.62	4.06	4.29	4.32	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	1	0	2.42	1406/1432	3.17	3.97	4.29	4.34	2.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	3	5	1	0	2.78	1128/1221	2.72	3.77	3.93	4.04	2.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.49	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	186/ 215	4.03	4.42	4.36	4.47	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	178/ 228	3.50	4.26	4.35	4.32	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	150/ 217	4.20	4.35	4.51	4.55	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	174/ 216	3.38	4.43	4.42	4.20	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	141/ 205	4.00	4.25	4.23	3.85	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 489B 0101
 Title BIOMECHANICS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 776
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	5	7	4.38	756/1522	4.38	4.11	4.30	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	976/1522	4.15	4.09	4.26	4.34	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	780/1285	4.23	4.12	4.30	4.42	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	735/1476	4.31	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1239/1412	3.38	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	372/1381	4.46	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1287/1500	3.54	4.06	4.18	4.25	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1054/1517	4.54	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	573/1497	4.33	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	946/1440	4.38	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	656/1448	4.85	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1018/1436	4.08	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	682/1432	4.46	3.97	4.29	4.34	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.77	3.93	4.04	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 489J 0101
 Title MATERIALS AND PROC MEM
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 777
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	404/1522	4.69	4.11	4.30	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	511/1522	4.54	4.09	4.26	4.34	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.12	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	613/1476	4.41	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	2	4	1	3	5	3.33	1257/1412	3.33	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	434/1381	4.40	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	201/1500	4.76	4.06	4.18	4.25	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	389/1517	4.92	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	240/1497	4.70	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	432/1440	4.77	4.37	4.45	4.52	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	564/1436	4.54	4.06	4.29	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	558/1432	4.58	3.97	4.29	4.34	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	239/1221	4.56	3.77	3.93	4.04	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	657/1280	4.14	3.53	4.10	4.28	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	508/1277	4.63	3.75	4.34	4.50	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	381/1269	4.75	3.94	4.31	4.49	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.42	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.26	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.35	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.43	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.25	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: ENME 489J 0101
 Title MATERIALS AND PROC MEM
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 777
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	22	Non-major	5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489S 0101
 Title SPACE TECH & DESIGN
 Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 778
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	9	3	3.63	1351/1522	3.63	4.11	4.30	4.42	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	8	4	3.74	1276/1522	3.74	4.09	4.26	4.34	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	7	3.84	1049/1285	3.84	4.12	4.30	4.42	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	956/1476	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1219/1412	3.41	3.44	4.06	4.11	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	6	2	6	3.42	1188/1381	3.42	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	1177/1517	4.39	4.78	4.65	4.71	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	7	5	1	3.43	1315/1497	3.43	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	7	7	4	3.83	1276/1440	3.83	4.37	4.45	4.52	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.56	4.71	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	7	3	4	3.47	1291/1436	3.47	4.06	4.29	4.32	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	5	4	3.50	1270/1432	3.50	3.97	4.29	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	841/1221	3.65	3.77	3.93	4.04	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1280	****	3.53	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1277	****	3.75	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1269	****	3.94	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.42	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.26	4.35	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 605 0101
 Title: SYSTEMS ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 779
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	3	4.33	814/1522	4.33	4.11	4.30	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.12	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1159/1476	3.83	4.03	4.22	4.31	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	3.44	4.06	4.25	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.00	3.91	4.08	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	387/1500	4.60	4.06	4.18	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1161/1517	4.40	4.78	4.65	4.73	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	718/1497	4.20	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.37	4.45	4.48	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	957/1436	4.17	4.06	4.29	4.37	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	949/1432	4.17	3.97	4.29	4.33	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.77	3.93	3.83	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1031/1280	3.50	3.53	4.10	4.24	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	3.75	4.34	4.52	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	3.94	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	3.72	4.02	4.08	3.50	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	3	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: ENME 640 0101
 Title FUND FLUID MECH I
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 780
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	2	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.11	4.30	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.12	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1367/1412	2.75	3.44	4.06	4.25	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.91	4.08	4.25	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1262/1500	3.60	4.06	4.18	4.22	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1370/1497	3.25	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1345/1440	3.60	4.37	4.45	4.48	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1197/1436	3.80	4.06	4.29	4.37	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	3.97	4.29	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1011/1221	3.25	3.77	3.93	3.83	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	3.53	4.10	4.24	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	3.75	4.34	4.52	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	3.94	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.72	4.02	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	89/ 215	4.50	4.42	4.36	4.72	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	178/ 228	4.00	4.26	4.35	4.39	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	210/ 217	3.50	4.35	4.51	4.61	3.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.43	4.42	4.76	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.25	4.23	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 677 0101
 Title APPLIED ELASTICITY
 Instructor: HAN, DAVID K.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 781
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	9	3	4.15	1001/1522	4.15	4.11	4.30	4.45	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	824/1522	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	499/1285	4.54	4.12	4.30	4.31	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1136/1476	3.89	4.03	4.22	4.31	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	688/1412	4.11	3.44	4.06	4.25	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	938/1381	3.90	3.91	4.08	4.25	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	454/1500	4.54	4.06	4.18	4.22	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	901/1517	4.69	4.78	4.65	4.73	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	674/1497	4.23	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	705/1440	4.58	4.37	4.45	4.48	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1001/1448	4.67	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	708/1436	4.42	4.06	4.29	4.37	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	745/1432	4.42	3.97	4.29	4.33	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1165/1221	2.50	3.77	3.93	3.83	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	5	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	3.53	4.10	4.24	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	930/1277	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	637/1269	4.44	3.94	4.31	4.51	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	3.72	4.02	4.08	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.26	4.35	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 812P 0101
 Title ANALOG AND DIGITAL ELE
 Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 782
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	4	4.29	869/1522	4.29	4.11	4.30	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1335/1522	3.57	4.09	4.26	4.29	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1193/1285	3.43	4.12	4.30	4.31	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1217/1476	3.71	4.03	4.22	4.31	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.44	4.06	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	992/1381	3.83	3.91	4.08	4.25	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.06	4.18	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1386/1497	3.20	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	716/1440	4.57	4.37	4.45	4.48	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.56	4.71	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1241/1436	3.67	4.06	4.29	4.37	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1224/1432	3.67	3.97	4.29	4.33	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1038/1221	3.17	3.77	3.93	3.83	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	390/1280	4.50	3.53	4.10	4.24	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	804/1277	4.25	3.75	4.34	4.52	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	777/1269	4.25	3.94	4.31	4.51	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.72	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 813B 0101
 Title MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 783
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	6	4.63	472/1522	4.63	4.11	4.30	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	407/1522	4.63	4.09	4.26	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.12	4.30	4.31	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.03	4.22	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	566/1412	4.25	3.44	4.06	4.25	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	207/1381	4.67	3.91	4.08	4.25	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1500	4.83	4.06	4.18	4.22	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	296/1497	4.63	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.37	4.45	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.56	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.06	4.29	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1432	4.88	3.97	4.29	4.33	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	232/1221	4.57	3.77	3.93	3.83	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1280	4.60	3.53	4.10	4.24	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	3.75	4.34	4.52	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.94	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	3.72	4.02	4.08	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 1		