

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 731
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	7	8	2	3.61	1474/1674	3.43	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	1284/1674	3.79	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	10	6	4.17	915/1423	4.06	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	9	3	3.83	1266/1609	3.78	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	996/1585	3.75	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	6	4	1	3.00	1435/1535	3.07	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	6	3	3	3.11	1553/1651	3.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	944/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	7	5	1	3.43	1412/1656	3.31	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1243/1586	4.18	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1275/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	8	6	3	3.61	1367/1582	3.74	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	5	4	3.56	1358/1575	3.40	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	3	7	2	1	2.80	1280/1380	3.07	3.94	3.94	3.78	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1059/1520	3.59	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1260/1515	3.59	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	6	6	0	3.14	1396/1511	3.07	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	257/ 265	3.40	4.06	4.23	3.97	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	233/ 278	3.63	4.21	4.19	3.97	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	199/ 260	3.80	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 259	3.60	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 233	4.00	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 731
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 732
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	4	4	5	3.25	1583/1674	3.43	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	9	4	3.70	1401/1674	3.79	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1070/1423	4.06	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	9	3	3.72	1341/1609	3.78	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	3	8	3	3.69	1107/1585	3.75	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	4	1	6	2	3.13	1421/1535	3.07	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1317/1651	3.44	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.88	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	1494/1656	3.31	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	1144/1586	4.18	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1175/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	8	4	3.88	1233/1582	3.74	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	2	3	5	3.25	1445/1575	3.40	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	0	1	5	1	3.33	1127/1380	3.07	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	7	4	3.47	1184/1520	3.59	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	1297/1515	3.59	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	3	3	7	1	3.00	1420/1511	3.07	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	474/ 994	3.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	207/ 265	3.40	4.06	4.23	3.97	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	230/ 278	3.63	4.21	4.19	3.97	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	250/ 260	3.80	4.43	4.46	4.41	3.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	228/ 259	3.60	4.21	4.33	4.19	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	150/ 233	4.00	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 732
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101H 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR SCI -HONORS
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 733
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	5	7	1	3.05	1622/1674	3.05	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	9	3	3.63	1436/1674	3.63	4.26	4.23	4.16	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	6	4	3.53	1264/1423	3.53	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	6	6	2	3.28	1513/1609	3.28	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	4	7	0	1	2.22	1568/1585	2.22	4.04	3.96	3.88	2.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	8	6	3	1	0	1.83	1534/1535	1.83	4.08	4.08	3.89	1.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	10	1	3.47	1454/1651	3.47	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	915/1673	4.79	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1526/1656	3.10	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1270/1586	4.07	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1309/1585	4.40	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	9	2	3.80	1272/1582	3.80	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1240/1575	3.86	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	3	5	2	1	2.92	1264/1380	2.92	3.94	3.94	3.78	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1291/1520	3.23	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1390/1515	3.21	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	5	4	1	3.08	1409/1511	3.08	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	2	0	5	1	0	2.63	956/ 994	2.63	3.97	3.94	3.73	2.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 14
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 734
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	1026/1674	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	3	9	8	4.10	1083/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	3	11	6	4.05	992/1423	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	1	5	10	4	3.85	1254/1609	3.80	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	2	1	3	4	8	2	3.39	1306/1585	3.40	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	2	3	9	5	3.89	1030/1535	3.45	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	2	0	5	7	6	3.75	1324/1651	3.70	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	1	12	0	3.79	1215/1656	3.75	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	0	0	9	10	4.19	1191/1586	4.18	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	0	4	15	4.48	1250/1585	4.48	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	1	12	7	4.14	1043/1582	3.99	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	793/1575	4.27	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1082/1380	3.37	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	7	1	4	4	2	2.61	1463/1520	2.83	4.14	4.01	3.76	2.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1379/1515	3.04	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	5	3	4	3	3	2.78	1464/1511	2.89	4.37	4.27	4.00	2.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 994	3.10	3.97	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 278	2.75	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 734
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 735
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	0	1	8	5	3	8	3.36	1555/1674	3.78	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	5	12	7	4.00	1146/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	15	6	4.04	992/1423	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	3	6	9	6	3.75	1320/1609	3.80	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	5	0	3	9	5	3.41	1297/1585	3.40	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	4	3	7	5	3	3.00	1435/1535	3.45	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	2	1	7	6	7	3.65	1381/1651	3.70	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	6	7	3	3.71	1275/1656	3.75	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	5	8	11	4.16	1211/1586	4.18	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	8	15	4.48	1241/1585	4.48	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	4	12	6	3.84	1250/1582	3.99	4.30	4.26	4.17	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	6	10	9	4.12	1080/1575	4.27	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	9	2	1	5	6	2	3.31	1137/1380	3.37	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	5	6	8	2	3.04	1345/1520	2.83	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	5	9	1	4	2.83	1453/1515	3.04	4.37	4.24	3.97	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	2	10	2	4	3.00	1420/1511	2.89	4.37	4.27	4.00	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	14	2	2	2	1	3	3.10	874/ 994	3.10	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	3	2	3	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	2	4	0	1	2.75	268/ 278	2.75	4.21	4.19	3.97	2.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	1	0	5	1	0	2.86	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	4	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0102
 Title: INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 735
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 200 0101
 Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS
 Instructor: McDaniel, Don
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 736
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	4	3	3	2	3.25	1583/1674	3.25	4.23	4.27	4.32	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1590/1674	3.17	4.26	4.23	4.26	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1296/1423	3.42	4.36	4.27	4.36	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1480/1609	3.42	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	1491/1585	2.91	4.04	3.96	3.91	2.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	4	0	2	2.73	1601/1651	2.73	4.20	4.18	4.20	2.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1533/1673	4.08	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1377/1656	3.50	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	5	0	3	3.09	1532/1586	3.09	4.43	4.43	4.48	3.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1335/1585	4.36	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	3	1	3	3.27	1468/1582	3.27	4.30	4.26	4.35	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	1	3	3.09	1475/1575	3.09	4.32	4.27	4.39	3.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	887/1380	3.78	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.71	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	586/1511	4.57	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	638/ 994	3.75	3.97	3.94	3.98	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	10
?	0		

Course-Section: ENES 220 0101
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 737
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	11	44	4.65	419/1674	4.65	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	26	27	4.30	870/1674	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	9	20	28	4.20	894/1423	4.20	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	0	4	8	15	10	3.84	1266/1609	3.84	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	4	18	18	11	3.56	1193/1585	3.56	4.04	3.96	3.91	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	3	0	6	15	17	4.05	853/1535	4.05	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	28	22	4.13	998/1651	4.13	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	60	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	5	26	21	4.31	655/1656	4.31	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	8	20	31	4.33	1074/1586	4.33	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	9	49	4.78	853/1585	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	7	27	24	4.22	978/1582	4.22	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	23	30	4.32	905/1575	4.32	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	1	3	12	20	9	3.73	916/1380	3.73	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	5	0	5	6	3	3.11	1333/1520	3.11	4.14	4.01	4.03	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	4	3	8	3	2	2.80	1455/1515	2.80	4.37	4.24	4.28	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	5	0	7	6	1	2.89	1448/1511	2.89	4.37	4.27	4.28	2.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	12	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ENES 220 0101
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 737
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	21	1.00-1.99 1	B 30		
56-83	13	2.00-2.99 16	C 18	General 0	Under-grad 60 Non-major 18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 57	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 738
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	338/1674	4.85	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.85	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.90	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	934/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.95	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	345/1656	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	753/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	882/1582	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	692/1575	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1127/1380	3.11	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.03	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 265	4.83	4.06	4.23	4.34	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	57/ 278	4.67	4.21	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	56/ 260	4.83	4.43	4.46	4.51	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	115/ 259	4.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	130/ 233	4.17	4.36	4.20	4.48	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 739
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	338/1674	4.85	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.85	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	326/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	131/1535	4.90	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	934/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	706/1673	4.95	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1582	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1575	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1380	3.11	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.03	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 265	4.83	4.06	4.23	4.34	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	57/ 278	4.67	4.21	4.19	4.36	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	56/ 260	4.83	4.43	4.46	4.51	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	115/ 259	4.50	4.21	4.33	4.42	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	130/ 233	4.17	4.36	4.20	4.48	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	9

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0102
 Title
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 740
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	4.85	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	4.85	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1543/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	4.90	4.08	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	524/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	381/1656	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.11	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENES 220H 0102
 Title
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 741
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	4.85	4.26	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1609	4.85	4.23	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1543/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.91	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	4.90	4.08	4.08	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	524/1651	4.35	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	955/1656	4.43	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1300/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1582	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1575	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1217/1380	3.11	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.98	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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