

Course-Section: ENMG 652 1
 Title Mgmt,Leadership And Co
 Instructor: Izenberg,Illysa
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 765
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	470/1509	4.61	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	175/1509	4.83	4.44	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	638/1287	4.40	4.23	4.30	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.42	4.22	4.16	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	738/1489	4.28	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.98	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	438/1463	4.43	4.30	4.09	4.15	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	131/1438	4.94	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	339/1411	4.72	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	242/1236	4.56	4.30	4.00	3.98	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	237/1260	4.76	4.41	4.14	4.21	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	123/1255	4.94	4.59	4.33	4.43	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	337/1258	4.82	4.62	4.38	4.50	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	160/ 873	4.65	4.26	4.03	4.01	4.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.14	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 46	****	4.22	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	3.69	****

Course-Section: ENMG 652 1
 Title Mgmt,Leadership And Co
 Instructor: Izenberg,Ilysa
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 765
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	12	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 656 1
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Oliver,Michael (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 766
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.44	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.23	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.42	4.22	4.16	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	611/1406	4.24	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	334/1384	4.52	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	11	6	4.05	958/1489	4.05	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.98	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	545/1463	4.29	4.30	4.09	4.15	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	559/1438	4.62	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	562/1421	4.92	4.91	4.73	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	617/1411	4.61	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	634/1405	4.44	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	607/1236	3.92	4.30	4.00	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.41	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	740/1255	4.31	4.59	4.33	4.43	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	742/1258	4.38	4.62	4.38	4.50	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	6	1	6	3.79	595/ 873	3.79	4.26	4.03	4.01	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	41/ 49	3.83	4.14	4.26	4.16	3.83
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	37/ 46	3.83	4.22	4.31	4.11	3.83
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: ENMG 656 1
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Oliver, Michael (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 766
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	11	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 656 1
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 767
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.44	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.23	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.42	4.22	4.16	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	611/1406	4.24	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	334/1384	4.52	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	11	6	4.05	958/1489	4.05	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.98	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	628/1463	4.29	4.30	4.09	4.15	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	725/1438	4.62	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	322/1421	4.92	4.91	4.73	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	339/1411	4.61	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	778/1405	4.44	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	877/1236	3.92	4.30	4.00	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.41	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	740/1255	4.31	4.59	4.33	4.43	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	742/1258	4.38	4.62	4.38	4.50	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	6	1	6	3.79	595/ 873	3.79	4.26	4.03	4.01	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	41/ 49	3.83	4.14	4.26	4.16	3.83
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	37/ 46	3.83	4.22	4.31	4.11	3.83
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: ENMG 656 1
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 767
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	14	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	11	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 658 1
 Title Fin Mgmt For Sci&Engr
 Instructor: Peterson,Sandra
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 768
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	24	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	158/1509	4.86	4.44	4.26	4.25	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	101/1287	4.93	4.23	4.30	4.22	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	101/1459	4.89	4.42	4.22	4.16	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	126/1406	4.82	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	123/1384	4.79	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	121/1489	4.86	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	233/1506	4.96	4.98	4.67	4.71	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	84/1463	4.89	4.30	4.09	4.15	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.64	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	110/1411	4.93	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	137/1405	4.93	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	267/1236	4.52	4.30	4.00	3.98	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	109/1260	4.92	4.41	4.14	4.21	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.59	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	261/1258	4.88	4.62	4.38	4.50	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.26	4.03	4.01	4.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 24	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 12 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENMG 662 1
 Title Fin Decision-Making En
 Instructor: Fenton,Robert E
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 769
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1194/1509	3.93	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.44	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	894/1287	4.07	4.23	4.30	4.22	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	792/1459	4.23	4.42	4.22	4.16	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1166/1406	3.54	4.19	4.09	4.12	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	652/1489	4.36	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.93	466/1506	4.93	4.98	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	6	1	3.70	1142/1463	3.70	4.30	4.09	4.15	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1255/1438	3.93	4.64	4.46	4.49	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1037/1421	4.64	4.91	4.73	4.78	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1201/1411	3.77	4.55	4.31	4.33	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	625/1236	4.08	4.30	4.00	3.98	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	856/1260	3.92	4.41	4.14	4.21	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.59	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.62	4.38	4.50	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	545/ 873	3.89	4.26	4.03	4.01	3.89
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	7	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	7	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ENMG 690 1
 Title Innov & Tech Entrepren
 Instructor: Kirk,Julia L.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 770
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	976/1509	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	952/1509	4.17	4.44	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.23	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.42	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.51	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.32	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.98	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	690/1463	4.20	4.30	4.09	4.15	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.64	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.91	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.55	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1236	4.82	4.30	4.00	3.98	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.41	4.14	4.21	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.59	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.91	4.62	4.38	4.50	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	139/ 873	4.70	4.26	4.03	4.01	4.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.40	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.03	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.32	4.45	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 49	4.75	4.14	4.26	4.16	4.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.14	4.08	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.22	4.31	4.11	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.05	3.69	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.26	5.00

Course-Section: ENMG 690 1
 Title Innov & Tech Entrepren
 Instructor: Kirk,Julia L.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 770
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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