

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 110 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 56				
Title: Statics										Questionnaires: 19				
Instructor: Irvine,David E														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	341/1589	4.74	4.19	4.32	4.20	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	922/1589	4.28	3.92	4.29	4.28	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	679/1391	4.44	4.08	4.34	4.29	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	1186/1552	3.91	3.99	4.25	4.16	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	7	4	3.87	1057/1495	3.87	3.61	4.14	4.07	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1129/1457	3.75	3.93	4.15	3.99	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	899/1572	4.21	3.89	4.21	4.18	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	519/1589	4.89	4.77	4.66	4.59	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1263/1569	3.69	3.94	4.13	4.08	3.69
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	1300/1530	4.05	4.25	4.49	4.45	4.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	994/1533	4.74	4.61	4.75	4.69	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	9	1	3.42	1428/1528	3.42	4.00	4.35	4.31	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	4	7	3.63	1378/1529	3.63	3.98	4.36	4.31	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	877/1393	3.94	3.83	4.06	3.99	3.94
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	162/1337	4.88	4.16	4.17	4.01	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	9	6	4.12	948/1331	4.12	4.39	4.35	4.18	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	971/1333	4.12	4.36	4.40	4.22	4.12

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 110 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Statics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Irvine,David E</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	2	2	5	0	3.10	940/1014	3.10	3.75	4.05	3.91	3.10

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 204 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Engr Design W/ Cad</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mogavero, Marc A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	9	8	3.96	1238/1589	3.96	4.19	4.32	4.33	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	8	7	3.78	1341/1589	3.78	3.92	4.29	4.30	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	10	10	4.36	771/1391	4.36	4.08	4.34	4.36	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	9	8	4.14	976/1552	4.14	3.99	4.25	4.26	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	9	2	4	3.05	1432/1495	3.05	3.61	4.14	4.18	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	4	4	7	5	3.52	1260/1457	3.52	3.93	4.15	4.14	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	8	4	7	3.59	1370/1572	3.59	3.89	4.21	4.19	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	1042/1589	4.57	4.77	4.66	4.63	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	8	7	3	3.58	1333/1569	3.58	3.94	4.13	4.12	3.58
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	8	11	4.13	1259/1530	4.13	4.25	4.49	4.47	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	1407/1533	4.30	4.61	4.75	4.78	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	9	10	4.17	1058/1528	4.17	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	4	12	4.09	1138/1529	4.09	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	774/1393	4.05	3.83	4.06	4.13	4.05
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	766/1337	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.16	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	6	3	7	3.83	1109/1331	3.83	4.39	4.35	4.32	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	8	3	7	3.94	1044/1333	3.94	4.36	4.40	4.39	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	525/1014	4.07	3.75	4.05	4.03	4.07

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 204 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Engr Design W/ Cad</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mogavero, Marc A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	75/180	4.38	4.35	4.20	4.50	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	136/194	3.92	4.27	4.17	4.12	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	107/178	4.45	4.32	4.47	4.63	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	75/181	4.58	4.33	4.40	4.55	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	91/165	4.18	4.12	4.12	4.42	4.18
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.26	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 204 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Engr Design W/ Cad</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mogavero, Marc A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>24</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 217 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Engr Thermodynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tshibangu,Wa-Mu</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	0	8	12	5	3.57	1476/1589	3.57	4.19	4.32	4.33	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	7	9	4	3.18	1539/1589	3.18	3.92	4.29	4.30	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	2	5	10	7	3.50	1298/1391	3.50	4.08	4.34	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	3	4	3	4	2	2.88	1532/1552	2.88	3.99	4.25	4.26	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	3	2	7	3	3	3.06	1432/1495	3.06	3.61	4.14	4.18	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1146/1457	3.74	3.93	4.15	4.14	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	10	6	9	3.75	1287/1572	3.75	3.89	4.21	4.19	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	373/1589	4.93	4.77	4.66	4.63	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	5	10	6	0	2.72	1544/1569	2.72	3.94	4.13	4.12	2.72
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	5	14	5	3	3.07	1506/1530	3.07	4.25	4.49	4.47	3.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	5	13	8	3.90	1501/1533	3.90	4.61	4.75	4.78	3.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	7	9	5	3	2.79	1501/1528	2.79	4.00	4.35	4.35	2.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	7	5	5	4	2.66	1507/1529	2.66	3.98	4.36	4.39	2.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	7	2	10	3	4	2.81	1348/1393	2.81	3.83	4.06	4.13	2.81
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	8	16	4.46	491/1337	4.46	4.16	4.17	4.16	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	6	6	14	4.31	788/1331	4.31	4.39	4.35	4.32	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	11	10	4.08	986/1333	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.39	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	3	19	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.03	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 217 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Engr Thermodynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tshibangu,Wa-Mu</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	4.42	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 220 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mechanics Of Materials</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Charalambides,P</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>83</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	17	60	4.69	393/1589	4.69	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	11	35	32	4.19	1015/1589	4.19	3.92	4.29	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	15	33	27	4.01	1055/1391	4.01	4.08	4.34	4.36	4.01
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	29	0	3	6	25	18	4.12	998/1552	4.12	3.99	4.25	4.26	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	12	4	8	17	18	22	3.67	1215/1495	3.67	3.61	4.14	4.18	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	40	0	0	8	8	24	4.40	509/1457	4.40	3.93	4.15	4.14	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	5	20	54	4.59	409/1572	4.59	3.89	4.21	4.19	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	1	79	4.95	234/1589	4.95	4.77	4.66	4.63	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	2	11	27	36	4.28	670/1569	4.28	3.94	4.13	4.12	4.28
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	18	57	4.65	661/1530	4.65	4.25	4.49	4.47	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	78	4.96	235/1533	4.96	4.61	4.75	4.78	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	23	33	19	3.81	1305/1528	3.81	4.00	4.35	4.35	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	5	14	23	35	4.03	1165/1529	4.03	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	3	5	16	17	22	3.79	972/1393	3.79	3.83	4.06	4.13	3.79
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	68	0	3	1	5	1	5	3.27	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.16	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.32	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	68	12	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.03	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 220 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mechanics Of Materials</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Charalambides,P</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>83</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.50	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	78	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	78	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	78	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	78	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	4.42	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.07	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	78	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.06	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	78	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	3.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	78	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.26	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/40	****	****	3.89	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	78	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	78	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/29	****	****	4.15	3.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	78	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.60	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.01	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	****/22	****	****	4.12	3.93	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	79	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.30	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 220 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mechanics Of Materials</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Charalambides,P</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>83</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	78	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	78	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.56	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	74	Graduate	0	Major	73
28-55	23	1.00-1.99	0	B	42						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	83	Non-major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	25	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 220H 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Honors Mechanics of Mate</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Charalambides,P</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	519/1589	4.60	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	765/1589	4.40	3.92	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	402/1391	4.67	4.08	4.34	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	509/1552	4.50	3.99	4.25	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1086/1495	3.83	3.61	4.14	4.18	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1087/1457	3.80	3.93	4.15	4.14	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1313/1572	3.70	3.89	4.21	4.19	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	467/1589	4.90	4.77	4.66	4.63	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	596/1569	4.33	3.94	4.13	4.12	4.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1016/1530	4.40	4.25	4.49	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.61	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	817/1528	4.40	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	852/1529	4.40	3.98	4.36	4.39	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	467/1393	4.38	3.83	4.06	4.13	4.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	550/1337	4.40	4.16	4.17	4.16	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.39	4.35	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.39	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 220H 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 12
<b>Title:</b> Honors Mechanics of Mate		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 11
<b>Instructor:</b> Charalambides,P		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	554/1014	4.00	3.75	4.05	4.03	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 301 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Struct/Prop:Engr Materls</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Topoleski,L D</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	8	14	33	4.33	884/1589	4.33	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	7	19	20	10	3.50	1471/1589	3.50	3.92	4.29	4.26	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	8	12	20	10	3.28	1331/1391	3.28	4.08	4.34	4.30	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	2	2	9	13	11	3.78	1281/1552	3.78	3.99	4.25	4.24	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	3	8	18	18	3.84	1076/1495	3.84	3.61	4.14	4.11	3.84
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	25	0	4	9	7	11	3.81	1087/1457	3.81	3.93	4.15	4.13	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	7	21	23	4.02	1086/1572	4.02	3.89	4.21	4.18	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	48	4.87	545/1589	4.87	4.77	4.66	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	2	11	18	15	3.94	1043/1569	3.94	3.94	4.13	4.10	3.94
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	8	18	28	4.21	1201/1530	4.21	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	49	4.84	757/1533	4.84	4.61	4.75	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	6	8	26	17	3.95	1221/1528	3.95	4.00	4.35	4.33	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	8	18	20	3.80	1313/1529	3.80	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	2	8	7	13	9	3.49	1152/1393	3.49	3.83	4.06	4.10	3.49
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	47	3	2	2	0	1	3	3.13	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	ENME 301 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	63
<b>Title:</b>	Struct/Prop:Engr Materls		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	58
<b>Instructor:</b>	Topoleski,L D			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	3.94	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/62	****	****	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 301 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Struct/Prop:Engr Materls</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Topoleski,L D</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>58</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	52	Graduate	0	Major	54
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	4
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 301H 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Honors Struct/Prop:Engr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Topoleski,L D</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.19	4.32	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1151/1589	4.00	3.92	4.29	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	600/1391	4.50	4.08	4.34	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	509/1552	4.50	3.99	4.25	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	899/1495	4.00	3.61	4.14	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	400/1457	4.50	3.93	4.15	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1509/1572	3.00	3.89	4.21	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1589	4.75	4.77	4.66	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1569	4.67	3.94	4.13	4.10	4.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	644/1530	4.67	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.61	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1529	5.00	3.98	4.36	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	221/1393	4.67	3.83	4.06	4.10	4.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1337	5.00	4.16	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.39	4.35	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.41	5.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 301H 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Honors Struct/Prop:Engr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Topoleski,L D</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	554/1014	4.00	3.75	4.05	4.04	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 303 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Topics In Engineer Math</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Spence,Anne M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>42</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	10	27	4.58	557/1589	4.58	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	9	24	4.40	765/1589	4.40	3.92	4.29	4.26	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	15	24	4.58	517/1391	4.58	4.08	4.34	4.30	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	2	0	2	12	17	4.27	826/1552	4.27	3.99	4.25	4.24	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	0	7	9	15	3.89	1038/1495	3.89	3.61	4.14	4.11	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	6	4	7	7	13	3.46	1290/1457	3.46	3.93	4.15	4.13	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	11	25	4.50	495/1572	4.50	3.89	4.21	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	140/1589	4.97	4.77	4.66	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	9	19	4.47	425/1569	4.47	3.94	4.13	4.10	4.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	3	1	4	8	19	4.11	1273/1530	4.11	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	6	30	4.64	1127/1533	4.64	4.61	4.75	4.75	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	3	2	1	11	19	4.14	1088/1528	4.14	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	7	1	4	8	16	3.69	1359/1529	3.69	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	2	2	1	6	20	4.29	551/1393	4.29	3.83	4.06	4.10	4.29
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	5	1	8	15	3.94	894/1337	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.20	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	1	5	6	17	4.13	938/1331	4.13	4.39	4.35	4.35	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	5	5	17	4.21	914/1333	4.21	4.36	4.40	4.41	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	2	2	2	2	14	4.09	511/1014	4.09	3.75	4.05	4.04	4.09

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 303 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Topics In Engineer Math</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Spence,Anne M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>42</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	46/180	4.55	4.35	4.20	4.08	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	2	0	0	0	9	4.27	89/194	4.27	4.27	4.17	4.05	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	3.94	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 303 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Topics In Engineer Math</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Spence,Anne M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>42</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/16	****	****	4.25	5.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 30	Required for Majors 35	Graduate 0 Major 32
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 42 Non-major 10
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	ENME 304 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	33
<b>Title:</b>	Machine Design		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	29
<b>Instructor:</b>	Rothman,Neil S			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	6	18	4.34	858/1589	4.34	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	13	4.17	1024/1589	4.17	3.92	4.29	4.26	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	8	7	9	3.59	1283/1391	3.59	4.08	4.34	4.30	3.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	12	10	4.07	1037/1552	4.07	3.99	4.25	4.24	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	2	2	7	8	3.68	1203/1495	3.68	3.61	4.14	4.11	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	4	10	9	4.13	804/1457	4.13	3.93	4.15	4.13	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	233/1572	4.75	3.89	4.21	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	6	4.22	1376/1589	4.22	4.77	4.66	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	646/1569	4.29	3.94	4.13	4.10	4.29
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	311/1530	4.86	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.61	4.75	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	12	16	4.48	719/1528	4.48	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	6	15	4.22	1031/1529	4.22	3.98	4.36	4.34	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	274/1393	4.59	3.83	4.06	4.10	4.59
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	452/1337	4.50	4.16	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	846/1331	4.22	4.39	4.35	4.35	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	902/1333	4.22	4.36	4.40	4.41	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 304 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Machine Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rothman,Neil S</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.05	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	3.94	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.58	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.80	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.48	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.15	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.25	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.49	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.25	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 304 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Machine Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rothman,Neil S</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	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 25	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		Major 27
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 29
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 320 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Fluid Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Eggleton, Charle</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>41</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	30	4.66	449/1589	4.66	4.19	4.32	4.33	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	11	26	4.51	599/1589	4.51	3.92	4.29	4.26	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	32	4.73	320/1391	4.73	4.08	4.34	4.30	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	731/1552	4.35	3.99	4.25	4.24	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	6	11	6	13	3.51	1301/1495	3.51	3.61	4.14	4.11	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	557/1457	4.37	3.93	4.15	4.13	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	9	26	4.46	555/1572	4.46	3.89	4.21	4.18	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	4	35	4.90	493/1589	4.90	4.77	4.66	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	9	12	12	4.03	941/1569	4.03	3.94	4.13	4.10	4.03
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	7	5	25	4.24	1177/1530	4.24	4.25	4.49	4.49	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	9	30	4.68	1073/1533	4.68	4.61	4.75	4.75	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	8	6	22	4.07	1129/1528	4.07	4.00	4.35	4.33	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	6	6	6	19	3.80	1313/1529	3.80	3.98	4.36	4.34	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	4	4	5	5	13	3.61	1083/1393	3.61	3.83	4.06	4.10	3.61
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.41	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 320 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Fluid Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Eggleton, Charle</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>41</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	33	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.04	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	36
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 332L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Solid Mech And Mat Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Khan,Akhtar</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	14	6	3.86	1326/1589	3.86	4.19	4.32	4.33	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	8	12	1	3.19	1538/1589	3.19	3.92	4.29	4.26	3.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	6	10	5	3.44	1307/1391	3.44	4.08	4.34	4.30	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	10	8	5	3.50	1421/1552	3.50	3.99	4.25	4.24	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	14	1	2	8	0	0	2.64	1479/1495	2.64	3.61	4.14	4.11	2.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	5	8	8	3.83	1060/1457	3.83	3.93	4.15	4.13	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	3	7	5	6	3.24	1477/1572	3.24	3.89	4.21	4.18	3.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1589	5.00	4.77	4.66	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	12	3	2	3.00	1508/1569	3.00	3.94	4.13	4.10	3.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	7	14	4	3.57	1459/1530	3.57	4.25	4.49	4.49	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	9	15	4.39	1355/1533	4.39	4.61	4.75	4.75	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	12	9	2	3.21	1469/1528	3.21	4.00	4.35	4.33	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	10	6	3	2.89	1499/1529	2.89	3.98	4.36	4.34	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	3	4	2	2	1	2.50	1367/1393	2.50	3.83	4.06	4.10	2.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.04	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 332L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Solid Mech And Mat Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Khan,Akhtar</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>28</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	113/180	4.00	4.35	4.20	4.08	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	73/194	4.43	4.27	4.17	4.05	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	122/178	4.36	4.32	4.47	4.42	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	136/181	4.17	4.33	4.40	4.31	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	122/165	3.79	4.12	4.12	3.94	3.79

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 403 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Automatic Controls</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tshibangu,Wa-Mu</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>59</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	11	11	18	9	8	2.86	1571/1589	2.86	4.19	4.32	4.46	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	18	15	14	4	6	2.39	1581/1589	2.39	3.92	4.29	4.35	2.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	8	23	14	7	5	2.61	1384/1391	2.61	4.08	4.34	4.46	2.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	21	11	8	8	3	4	2.44	1546/1552	2.44	3.99	4.25	4.37	2.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	19	10	10	7	5	5	2.59	1481/1495	2.59	3.61	4.14	4.25	2.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	20	6	8	12	7	3	2.81	1438/1457	2.81	3.93	4.15	4.30	2.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	10	12	14	11	10	2.98	1513/1572	2.98	3.89	4.21	4.28	2.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	53	4.95	280/1589	4.95	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	22	13	14	3	1	2.02	1563/1569	2.02	3.94	4.13	4.22	2.02
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	13	15	12	10	4	2.57	1523/1530	2.57	4.25	4.49	4.56	2.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	4	19	17	6	8	2.91	1530/1533	2.91	4.61	4.75	4.76	2.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	19	18	9	3	5	2.20	1522/1528	2.20	4.00	4.35	4.41	2.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	21	15	8	3	6	2.21	1520/1529	2.21	3.98	4.36	4.44	2.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	15	9	10	4	4	2.36	1376/1393	2.36	3.83	4.06	4.18	2.36
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 403 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 67
<b>Title:</b> Automatic Controls		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 59
<b>Instructor:</b> Tshibangu,Wa-Mu		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	54	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	Graduate	Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	28			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	Under-grad	Non-major
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	13	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives		
				P	0			
				I	0	Other		
				?	8			

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 408 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Sel Top Engr Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Mogavero, Marc A</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>27</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	6	9	10	4.08	1131/1589	4.08	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	15	8	4.19	1005/1589	4.19	3.92	4.29	4.35	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	564/1391	4.54	4.08	4.34	4.46	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	4	9	9	3.88	1202/1552	3.88	3.99	4.25	4.37	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	4	4	7	5	3.41	1357/1495	3.41	3.61	4.14	4.25	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	10	4	7	3.35	1336/1457	3.35	3.93	4.15	4.30	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	6	14	4.12	995/1572	4.12	3.89	4.21	4.28	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	806/1589	4.77	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1081/1569	3.90	3.94	4.13	4.22	3.90
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	1016/1530	4.40	4.25	4.49	4.56	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	23	4.84	757/1533	4.84	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	11	9	4.12	1096/1528	4.12	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	9	7	3.76	1330/1529	3.76	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	10	8	4.14	697/1393	4.14	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.14
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.56	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 408 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 28
<b>Title:</b> Sel Top Engr Design		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 27
<b>Instructor:</b> Mogavero, Marc A		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 412 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mech Design:Manuf/Prod</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arola,Dwayne D</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	519/1589	4.61	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	891/1589	4.30	3.92	4.29	4.35	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	12	7	4.04	1038/1391	4.04	4.08	4.34	4.46	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	5	9	4	3.94	1144/1552	3.94	3.99	4.25	4.37	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	8	10	3	3.76	1145/1495	3.76	3.61	4.14	4.25	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	886/1457	4.00	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	977/1572	4.13	3.89	4.21	4.28	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	420/1589	4.91	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	352/1569	4.52	3.94	4.13	4.22	4.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	434/1530	4.78	4.25	4.49	4.56	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	293/1533	4.96	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	494/1528	4.65	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	544/1529	4.65	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	274/1393	4.59	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.59
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 412 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mech Design:Manuf/Prod</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Arola,Dwayne D</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	4.09	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.14	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	12				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 421 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Cond/Rad Heat Trans</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhu,Liang</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	477/1589	4.64	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	555/1589	4.55	3.92	4.29	4.35	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	330/1391	4.73	4.08	4.34	4.46	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	467/1552	4.55	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	673/1495	4.27	3.61	4.14	4.25	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	208/1457	4.70	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	267/1572	4.73	3.89	4.21	4.28	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1249/1589	4.36	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	272/1569	4.63	3.94	4.13	4.22	4.63
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1530	5.00	4.25	4.49	4.56	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	586/1533	4.91	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.00	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	474/1529	4.70	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	221/1393	4.67	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	944/1337	3.88	4.16	4.17	4.36	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1141/1331	3.75	4.39	4.35	4.56	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	965/1333	4.13	4.36	4.40	4.63	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 421 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Cond/Rad Heat Trans</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhu,Liang</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>11</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.54	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.31	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 423 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Heat, Vent, AC Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Baughan,James T</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>23</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	11	5	3.87	1319/1589	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.46	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	11	4	3.78	1341/1589	3.78	3.92	4.29	4.35	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	693/1391	4.43	4.08	4.34	4.46	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	837/1552	4.26	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	7	6	7	3.90	1019/1495	3.90	3.61	4.14	4.25	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	7	7	5	3.80	1087/1457	3.80	3.93	4.15	4.30	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	0	5	14	4.26	829/1572	4.26	3.89	4.21	4.28	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	572/1589	4.86	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1116/1569	3.87	3.94	4.13	4.22	3.87
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	7	8	5	3.90	1385/1530	3.90	4.25	4.49	4.56	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	729/1533	4.85	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	8	4	3.75	1333/1528	3.75	4.00	4.35	4.41	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	5	4	8	3.80	1313/1529	3.80	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	0	6	4	5	3.59	1099/1393	3.59	3.83	4.06	4.18	3.59
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 423 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 29
<b>Title:</b> Heat, Vent, AC Design		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 23
<b>Instructor:</b> Baughan,James T		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	21	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 432L 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 60
<b>Title:</b> Fluids/Energy Lab		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 31
<b>Instructor:</b> Zhu,Liang		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	8	7	13	4.03	1160/1589	4.03	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	15	11	4.20	996/1589	4.20	3.92	4.29	4.35	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	17	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1189/1391	3.82	4.08	4.34	4.46	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	9	16	4.27	837/1552	4.27	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	2	6	2	4	3.57	1267/1495	3.57	3.61	4.14	4.25	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	8	14	4.10	823/1457	4.10	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	7	9	10	3.80	1262/1572	3.80	3.89	4.21	4.28	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	467/1589	4.90	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	11	9	4.12	866/1569	4.12	3.94	4.13	4.22	4.12
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	5	21	4.64	677/1530	4.64	4.25	4.49	4.56	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	1087/1533	4.68	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	12	12	4.25	992/1528	4.25	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	4	12	9	4.12	1121/1529	4.12	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	8	6	6	3.81	965/1393	3.81	3.83	4.06	4.18	3.81
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	26	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 432L 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Fluids/Energy Lab</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhu,Liang</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>31</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	59/180	4.46	4.35	4.20	4.31	4.46
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	66/194	4.46	4.27	4.17	4.27	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	136/178	4.15	4.32	4.47	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	129/181	4.23	4.33	4.40	4.37	4.23
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	57/165	4.38	4.12	4.12	4.09	4.38

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 444 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mech Engr Systems Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tshibangu,Wa-Mu</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	8	2	4	3.16	1555/1589	3.83	4.19	4.32	4.46	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	6	2	3.05	1553/1589	3.65	3.92	4.29	4.35	3.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	6	2	3.11	1357/1391	3.80	4.08	4.34	4.46	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	3	6	2	3.06	1512/1552	3.78	3.99	4.25	4.37	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1347/1495	3.59	3.61	4.14	4.25	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	8	2	3	3.25	1364/1457	3.55	3.93	4.15	4.30	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	4	3	7	3.63	1350/1572	3.96	3.89	4.21	4.28	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1042/1589	4.72	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	2	6	1	2	2.67	1548/1569	3.52	3.94	4.13	4.22	2.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	7	6	3	3.37	1487/1530	3.97	4.25	4.49	4.56	3.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	3	3	4	7	3.58	1517/1533	4.08	4.61	4.75	4.76	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	5	6	5	0	2.68	1508/1528	3.70	4.00	4.35	4.41	2.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	5	4	3.00	1489/1529	3.64	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	5	3	5	3	2	2.67	1361/1393	3.63	3.83	4.06	4.18	2.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1322/1337	3.70	4.16	4.17	4.36	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1331	5.00	4.39	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1333	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.63	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 444 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 26
<b>Title:</b> Mech Engr Systems Design		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 19
<b>Instructor:</b> Tshibangu,Wa-Mu		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 444 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mech Engr Systems Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rothman,Neil S</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	646/1589	3.83	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	943/1589	3.65	3.92	4.29	4.35	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	600/1391	3.80	4.08	4.34	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	509/1552	3.78	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1153/1495	3.59	3.61	4.14	4.25	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1042/1457	3.55	3.93	4.15	4.30	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	801/1572	3.96	3.89	4.21	4.28	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	598/1589	4.72	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	546/1569	3.52	3.94	4.13	4.22	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	787/1530	3.97	4.25	4.49	4.56	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1205/1533	4.08	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	405/1528	3.70	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	974/1529	3.64	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	266/1393	3.63	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1337	3.70	4.16	4.17	4.36	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.39	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1333	5.00	4.36	4.40	4.63	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 444 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Mech Engr Systems Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Rothman,Neil S</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>8</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 471 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comp Aided Fin EI Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Wilkerson,Steph</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1384/1589	3.76	4.19	4.32	4.46	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	3	6	3.75	1363/1589	3.75	3.92	4.29	4.35	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	653/1391	4.47	4.08	4.34	4.46	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	816/1552	4.29	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	794/1495	4.15	3.61	4.14	4.25	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	629/1457	4.31	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1382/1572	3.56	3.89	4.21	4.28	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	703/1589	4.81	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	1185/1569	3.79	3.94	4.13	4.22	3.79
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	6	3	5	3.73	1434/1530	3.73	4.25	4.49	4.56	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1100/1533	4.67	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1341/1528	3.73	4.00	4.35	4.41	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	1227/1529	3.93	3.98	4.36	4.44	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	456/1393	4.38	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1337	****	4.16	4.17	4.36	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1331	****	4.39	4.35	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1333	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 471 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Comp Aided Fin EI Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Wilkerson,Steph</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	4.09	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 7	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 489 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Topics In Mech Engr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zupan,Marcus</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	871/1589	4.44	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1220/1589	4.10	3.92	4.29	4.35	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	8	6	4.00	1081/1552	4.06	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	899/1495	3.67	3.61	4.14	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	533/1457	4.37	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	4	1	3	8	0	0	2.58	1548/1572	3.00	3.89	4.21	4.28	2.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	651/1589	4.89	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	257/1569	4.77	3.94	4.13	4.22	4.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	452/1530	4.70	4.25	4.49	4.56	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	352/1533	4.80	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	336/1528	4.64	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	639/1529	4.69	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	400/1393	4.47	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.54
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	267/1337	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.36	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.39	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1333	4.93	4.36	4.40	4.63	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 489 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 20
<b>Title:</b> Spec Topics In Mech Engr		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 19
<b>Instructor:</b> Zupan,Marcus		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	395/1014	4.25	3.75	4.05	4.32	4.25

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 489 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Topics In Mech Engr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Spence,Anne M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	871/1589	4.44	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1220/1589	4.10	3.92	4.29	4.35	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	8	6	4.00	1081/1552	4.06	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	899/1495	3.67	3.61	4.14	4.25	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	533/1457	4.37	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	4	1	3	8	0	0	2.58	1548/1572	3.00	3.89	4.21	4.28	2.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	651/1589	4.89	4.77	4.66	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	103/1569	4.77	3.94	4.13	4.22	4.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	381/1530	4.70	4.25	4.49	4.56	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1296/1533	4.80	4.61	4.75	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	270/1528	4.64	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	308/1529	4.69	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	243/1393	4.47	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.54
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	267/1337	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.36	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.39	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1333	4.93	4.36	4.40	4.63	5.00



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 489 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 20
<b>Title:</b> Spec Topics In Mech Engr		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 19
<b>Instructor:</b> Spence,Anne M		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	395/1014	4.25	3.75	4.05	4.32	4.25

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	11	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 489 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Topics In Mech Engr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Storck,Steven M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	435/1589	4.44	4.19	4.32	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	765/1589	4.10	3.92	4.29	4.35	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	600/1391	4.50	4.08	4.34	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	943/1552	4.06	3.99	4.25	4.37	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	1437/1495	3.67	3.61	4.14	4.25	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	593/1457	4.37	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1240/1572	3.00	3.89	4.21	4.28	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1589	4.89	4.77	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1569	4.77	3.94	4.13	4.22	4.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	887/1530	4.70	4.25	4.49	4.56	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	4.80	4.61	4.75	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	909/1528	4.64	4.00	4.35	4.41	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	530/1529	4.69	3.98	4.36	4.44	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	510/1393	4.47	3.83	4.06	4.18	4.33
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	550/1337	4.63	4.16	4.17	4.36	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1331	5.00	4.39	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	373/1333	4.93	4.36	4.40	4.63	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1014	4.25	3.75	4.05	4.32	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 489 04</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Topics In Mech Engr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Storck,Steven M</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.27	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	4.09	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENME 605 01		Term - Fall 2012								Enrollment: 12				
Title: Systems Analysis I										Questionnaires: 10				
Instructor: Tasch,Uri														
		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1005/1589	4.20	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	996/1589	4.20	3.92	4.29	4.33	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	828/1391	4.30	4.08	4.34	4.40	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	987/1552	4.13	3.99	4.25	4.30	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1115/1495	3.80	3.61	4.14	4.18	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	886/1457	4.00	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	774/1572	4.30	3.89	4.21	4.29	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	1011/1589	4.60	4.77	4.66	4.79	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	369/1569	4.50	3.94	4.13	4.18	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	887/1530	4.50	4.25	4.49	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	959/1533	4.75	4.61	4.75	4.82	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	695/1528	4.50	4.00	4.35	4.38	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	883/1529	4.38	3.98	4.36	4.38	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1142/1393	3.50	3.83	4.06	3.91	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1066/1337	3.67	4.16	4.17	4.29	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	899/1331	4.17	4.39	4.35	4.51	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1107/1333	3.83	4.36	4.40	4.51	3.83

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 605 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Systems Analysis I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Tasch,Uri</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	554/1014	4.00	3.75	4.05	4.13	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 664 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhu,Weidong</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	1	6	7	3.88	1306/1589	3.88	4.19	4.32	4.39	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	1278/1589	3.88	3.92	4.29	4.33	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	719/1391	4.41	4.08	4.34	4.40	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1030/1552	4.07	3.99	4.25	4.30	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	0	3	3	4	3.38	1364/1495	3.38	3.61	4.14	4.18	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	2	1	4	4	3.46	1285/1457	3.46	3.93	4.15	4.30	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	1	6	7	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	3.89	4.21	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	1053/1589	4.56	4.77	4.66	4.79	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1347/1569	3.55	3.94	4.13	4.18	3.55
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	938/1530	4.46	4.25	4.49	4.55	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	1167/1533	4.62	4.61	4.75	4.82	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1328/1528	3.77	4.00	4.35	4.38	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	974/1529	4.29	3.98	4.36	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	796/1393	4.00	3.83	4.06	3.91	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1173/1337	3.43	4.16	4.17	4.29	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	989/1331	4.00	4.39	4.35	4.51	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1171/1333	3.71	4.36	4.40	4.51	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1014	****	3.75	4.05	4.13	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 664 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhu,Weidong</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	4.43	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.22	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.17	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 664 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Dynamics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhu,Weidong</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	6	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 670 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Continuum Mechanics</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Farquhar,Anthon</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>4</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1545/1589	3.25	4.19	4.32	4.39	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1527/1589	3.25	3.92	4.29	4.33	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1334/1391	3.25	4.08	4.34	4.40	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1081/1552	4.00	3.99	4.25	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1437/1495	3.00	3.61	4.14	4.18	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	886/1457	4.00	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1095/1572	4.00	3.89	4.21	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1116/1589	4.50	4.77	4.66	4.79	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1438/1569	3.33	3.94	4.13	4.18	3.33
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1169/1530	4.25	4.25	4.49	4.55	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	959/1533	4.75	4.61	4.75	4.82	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1409/1528	3.50	4.00	4.35	4.38	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1334/1529	3.75	3.98	4.36	4.38	3.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b> ENME 670 01	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b> 5
<b>Title:</b> Continuum Mechanics		<b>Questionnaires:</b> 4
<b>Instructor:</b> Farquhar,Anthon		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Lecture</b>														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1391/1393	1.00	3.83	4.06	3.91	1.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 811 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Top Mech Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anjanappa,Munis</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	557/1589	4.57	4.19	4.32	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	912/1589	4.29	3.92	4.29	4.33	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	971/1391	4.14	4.08	4.34	4.40	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	965/1552	4.14	3.99	4.25	4.30	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	609/1495	4.33	3.61	4.14	4.18	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	886/1457	4.00	3.93	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	616/1572	4.43	3.89	4.21	4.29	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1193/1589	4.43	4.77	4.66	4.79	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1125/1569	3.86	3.94	4.13	4.18	3.86
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	990/1530	4.43	4.25	4.49	4.55	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1205/1533	4.57	4.61	4.75	4.82	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1081/1528	4.14	4.00	4.35	4.38	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	974/1529	4.29	3.98	4.36	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	266/1393	4.60	3.83	4.06	3.91	4.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1271/1337	3.00	4.16	4.17	4.29	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1245/1331	3.33	4.39	4.35	4.51	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1271/1333	3.33	4.36	4.40	4.51	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1006/1014	2.00	3.75	4.05	4.13	2.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	ENME 811 02	<b>Term - Fall 2012</b>	<b>Enrollment:</b>	8
<b>Title:</b>	Spec Top Mech Design		<b>Questionnaires:</b>	7
<b>Instructor:</b>	Anjanappa,Munis			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/180	****	4.35	4.20	4.40	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/194	****	4.27	4.17	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/178	****	4.32	4.47	4.63	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/181	****	4.33	4.40	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.12	4.12	4.43	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/62	****	****	4.46	4.44	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/65	****	****	4.43	4.61	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.29	4.42	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	****	4.47	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/61	****	****	4.19	4.22	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.85	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/40	****	****	3.89	4.83	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.15	4.17	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/21	****	****	4.32	4.00	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/39	****	****	4.00	4.10	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.12	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/33	****	****	4.42	4.63	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>ENME 811 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Spec Top Mech Design</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Anjanappa,Munis</b>

**Term - Fall 2012**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>7</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/19	****	****	4.44	4.06	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/16	****	****	4.25	4.25	****

### Frequency Distribution

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