

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: GRINER, ANITA E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 838
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	5	1	3.07	1594/1639	3.07	4.31	4.27	4.42	3.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1469/1639	3.53	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1262/1397	3.53	4.51	4.28	4.37	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	6	2	3.27	1482/1583	3.27	4.31	4.19	4.31	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	5	0	2.67	1486/1532	2.67	4.07	4.01	4.10	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	8	0	3.31	1323/1504	3.31	4.14	4.05	4.29	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.13	4.16	4.27	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	7	0	3.38	1371/1579	3.19	4.13	4.08	4.17	3.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	947/1518	4.24	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1033/1520	4.62	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	7	3	3.67	1292/1517	3.51	4.43	4.27	4.32	3.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1368/1550	3.24	4.20	4.22	4.23	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1035/1295	3.49	4.31	3.94	3.95	3.49	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.37	4.07	4.22	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	694/1391	4.40	4.60	4.30	4.47	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	872/1388	4.20	4.53	4.28	4.49	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	531/ 958	3.91	4.39	3.93	4.01	3.91	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: GRINER, ANITA E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 838
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	5	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: PETER, JAMES (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 839
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	5	1	3.07	1594/1639	3.07	4.31	4.27	4.42	3.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	2	3.53	1469/1639	3.53	4.37	4.22	4.26	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1262/1397	3.53	4.51	4.28	4.37	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	6	2	3.27	1482/1583	3.27	4.31	4.19	4.31	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	5	0	2.67	1486/1532	2.67	4.07	4.01	4.10	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	8	0	3.31	1323/1504	3.31	4.14	4.05	4.29	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.13	4.16	4.27	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	4	5	4	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.19	4.13	4.08	4.17	3.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1213/1518	4.24	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1136/1520	4.62	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	0	6	3	3.36	1399/1517	3.51	4.43	4.27	4.32	3.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	2	7	1	3.07	1435/1550	3.24	4.20	4.22	4.23	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	943/1295	3.49	4.31	3.94	3.95	3.49	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.37	4.07	4.22	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	694/1391	4.40	4.60	4.30	4.47	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	872/1388	4.20	4.53	4.28	4.49	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	531/ 958	3.91	4.39	3.93	4.01	3.91	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: PETER, JAMES (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 839
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	5	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 652 8010
 Title MANAGEMENT AND COMMUN.
 Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 840
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	120/1639	4.94	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	455/1639	4.56	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.51	4.28	4.37	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	413/1583	4.56	4.31	4.19	4.31	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	158/1532	4.79	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.14	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	418/1612	4.57	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	97/1579	4.92	4.13	4.08	4.17	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	474/1517	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	376/1550	4.73	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	297/1295	4.47	4.31	3.94	3.95	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	277/1398	4.73	4.37	4.07	4.22	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.60	4.30	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	157/1388	4.93	4.53	4.28	4.49	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	163/ 958	4.64	4.39	3.93	4.01	4.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	2.92	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.58	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: ENMG 652 8010
 Title MANAGEMENT AND COMMUN.
 Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 840
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 656 8010
 Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 841
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	391/1639	4.69	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	709/1639	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.51	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	960/1583	4.08	4.31	4.19	4.31	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.14	4.05	4.29	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	760/1579	4.38	4.13	4.08	4.17	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1309/1518	4.46	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	833/1517	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	787/1550	4.58	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	623/1295	4.10	4.31	3.94	3.95	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	502/1398	4.42	4.37	4.07	4.22	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.60	4.30	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.53	4.28	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.39	3.93	4.01	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 9
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 11
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: ENMG 656 8010
 Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 842
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	391/1639	4.69	4.31	4.27	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	709/1639	4.38	4.37	4.22	4.26	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.51	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	960/1583	4.08	4.31	4.19	4.31	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.14	4.05	4.29	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.13	4.16	4.27	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	302/1579	4.38	4.13	4.08	4.17	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1518	4.46	4.46	4.43	4.49	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.76	4.70	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	287/1517	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	338/1550	4.58	4.20	4.22	4.23	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	505/1295	4.10	4.31	3.94	3.95	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	502/1398	4.42	4.37	4.07	4.22	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.60	4.30	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.53	4.28	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.39	3.93	4.01	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 9
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 11
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					