

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 705  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	2	4	3	13	3.84	1319/1649	3.82	4.10	4.28	4.11	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	6	8	8	3.72	1368/1648	3.81	3.92	4.23	4.16	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	5	8	3.60	1169/1375	3.66	3.82	4.27	4.10	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	10	3	9	3.68	1323/1595	3.86	4.01	4.20	4.03	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	6	6	8	3.74	1084/1533	3.41	3.53	4.04	3.87	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	1	3	6	8	3.59	1208/1512	3.66	3.86	4.10	3.86	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	4	10	3.83	1222/1623	3.84	3.98	4.16	4.08	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	4	8	3	3.71	1234/1621	3.80	3.89	4.06	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	6	6	10	3.96	1313/1568	4.15	4.17	4.43	4.39	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	1203/1572	4.51	4.64	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	6	9	3.83	1256/1564	3.79	3.85	4.28	4.20	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	3	11	3.75	1277/1559	3.64	3.85	4.29	4.20	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	2	4	9	3.84	854/1352	3.78	3.81	3.98	3.86	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	3	4	4	3	2.94	1281/1384	3.72	3.99	4.08	3.86	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	3	9	2	4	3.39	1238/1382	3.42	3.65	4.29	4.03	3.39	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	0	7	3	5	3.39	1212/1368	3.56	3.73	4.30	4.01	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	722/ 948	3.51	3.63	3.95	3.75	3.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 221	4.05	4.05	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 243	3.94	3.94	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 212	3.73	3.73	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 209	4.02	4.02	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 555	3.98	4.33	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 88	****	3.69	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	3.92	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 81	****	3.15	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 92	****	3.38	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.91	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	4	0	6	0	3.20	251/ 312	3.66	3.87	3.68	3.51	3.20	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 705  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 706  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	3	5	7	3.65	1436/1649	3.82	4.10	4.28	4.11	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	6	4	3.65	1415/1648	3.81	3.92	4.23	4.16	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	9	5	3.75	1112/1375	3.66	3.82	4.27	4.10	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	5	3.95	1134/1595	3.86	4.01	4.20	4.03	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	3	3	3	3	2.88	1480/1533	3.41	3.53	4.04	3.87	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	4	4	2	5	3.38	1330/1512	3.66	3.86	4.10	3.86	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	5	7	3.68	1308/1623	3.84	3.98	4.16	4.08	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	8	3	3.71	1234/1621	3.80	3.89	4.06	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	1112/1568	4.15	4.17	4.43	4.39	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	1412/1572	4.51	4.64	4.70	4.64	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	5	3	8	3.74	1306/1564	3.79	3.85	4.28	4.20	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	2	6	6	3.53	1364/1559	3.64	3.85	4.29	4.20	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	4	2	4	7	3.53	1039/1352	3.78	3.81	3.98	3.86	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	9	5	3.88	896/1384	3.72	3.99	4.08	3.86	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	1	4	6	1	2.94	1335/1382	3.42	3.65	4.29	4.03	2.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	1	2	7	2	3.13	1279/1368	3.56	3.73	4.30	4.01	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	789/ 948	3.51	3.63	3.95	3.75	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 221	4.05	4.05	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 243	3.94	3.94	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 212	3.73	3.73	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	4.02	4.02	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	272/ 555	3.98	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	3.69	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	3.92	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.15	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.38	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.91	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 312	3.66	3.87	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 706  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0103  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 707  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	2	1	10	10	3.96	1218/1649	3.82	4.10	4.28	4.11	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	10	8	3.77	1340/1648	3.81	3.92	4.23	4.16	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	3	10	3.54	1196/1375	3.66	3.82	4.27	4.10	3.54		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	9	9	3.92	1175/1595	3.86	4.01	4.20	4.03	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	0	7	4	6	3.38	1323/1533	3.41	3.53	4.04	3.87	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	5	9	7	3.83	1075/1512	3.66	3.86	4.10	3.86	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	8	11	3.96	1089/1623	3.84	3.98	4.16	4.08	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	5	5	8	5	3.57	1319/1621	3.80	3.89	4.06	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	7	2	14	4.00	1279/1568	4.15	4.17	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	1212/1572	4.51	4.64	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	1	6	7	8	3.54	1379/1564	3.79	3.85	4.28	4.20	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	3	3	8	7	3.44	1392/1559	3.64	3.85	4.29	4.20	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	5	7	9	3.80	879/1352	3.78	3.81	3.98	3.86	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	7	8	9	3.96	831/1384	3.72	3.99	4.08	3.86	3.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	5	8	7	3.67	1146/1382	3.42	3.65	4.29	4.03	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	4	7	9	3.91	1023/1368	3.56	3.73	4.30	4.01	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	3	6	2	5	3.56	686/ 948	3.51	3.63	3.95	3.75	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	163/ 221	4.05	4.05	4.16	4.05	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	155/ 243	3.94	3.94	4.12	4.08	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	192/ 212	3.73	3.73	4.40	4.43	3.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	136/ 209	4.02	4.02	4.35	4.38	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	3	3	1	4	3.55	467/ 555	3.98	4.33	4.29	4.14	3.55	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 88	****	3.69	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 85	****	3.92	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 81	****	3.15	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.38	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.91	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	46/ 312	3.66	3.87	3.68	3.51	4.29	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0103  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 707  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0104  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 708  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	13	6	3.84	1319/1649	3.82	4.10	4.28	4.11	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	8	4.12	1043/1648	3.81	3.92	4.23	4.16	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	10	7	3.76	1107/1375	3.66	3.82	4.27	4.10	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	11	6	3.87	1225/1595	3.86	4.01	4.20	4.03	3.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	4	7	8	3.63	1166/1533	3.41	3.53	4.04	3.87	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	12	6	3.84	1062/1512	3.66	3.86	4.10	3.86	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	10	7	3.88	1192/1623	3.84	3.98	4.16	4.08	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	531/1646	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	731/1621	3.80	3.89	4.06	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	13	11	4.36	1021/1568	4.15	4.17	4.43	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	912/1572	4.51	4.64	4.70	4.64	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	13	6	4.04	1109/1564	3.79	3.85	4.28	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	7	10	3.84	1226/1559	3.64	3.85	4.29	4.20	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	2	4	9	7	3.95	754/1352	3.78	3.81	3.98	3.86	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	9	9	4.08	767/1384	3.72	3.99	4.08	3.86	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	3	7	6	8	3.68	1137/1382	3.42	3.65	4.29	4.03	3.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	6	8	8	3.80	1071/1368	3.56	3.73	4.30	4.01	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	0	7	5	5	3.72	614/ 948	3.51	3.63	3.95	3.75	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	110/ 221	4.05	4.05	4.16	4.05	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	176/ 243	3.94	3.94	4.12	4.08	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	188/ 212	3.73	3.73	4.40	4.43	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	172/ 209	4.02	4.02	4.35	4.38	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	453/ 555	3.98	4.33	4.29	4.14	3.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 88	****	3.69	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 85	****	3.92	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 81	****	3.15	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.38	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 288	****	3.91	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	217/ 312	3.66	3.87	3.68	3.51	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101 0104  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 708  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ENES 101H 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGR SCI -HONORS  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 709  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	6	7	13	4.27	954/1649	4.27	4.10	4.28	4.11	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	10	8	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.92	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	15	6	3.92	1017/1375	3.92	3.82	4.27	4.10	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	12	8	4.04	1049/1595	4.04	4.01	4.20	4.03	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	2	9	7	3.65	1146/1533	3.65	3.53	4.04	3.87	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	6	6	10	4.04	863/1512	4.04	3.86	4.10	3.86	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	14	9	4.19	883/1623	4.19	3.98	4.16	4.08	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	266/1646	4.96	4.97	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	4	9	6	4.11	859/1621	4.11	3.89	4.06	3.96	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	14	9	4.23	1137/1568	4.23	4.17	4.43	4.39	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	640/1572	4.88	4.64	4.70	4.64	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	11	8	3.96	1163/1564	3.96	3.85	4.28	4.20	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	11	9	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	3.85	4.29	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	4	5	6	8	3.67	970/1352	3.67	3.81	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	644/1384	4.30	3.99	4.08	3.86	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	4	6	9	4	3.57	1191/1382	3.57	3.65	4.29	4.03	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	3	10	6	3.82	1067/1368	3.82	3.73	4.30	4.01	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	821/ 948	3.17	3.63	3.95	3.75	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 221	****	4.05	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.94	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 212	****	3.73	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.02	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	3.69	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	3.92	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	3.15	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.38	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.91	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	****/ 312	****	3.87	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101H 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGR SCI -HONORS  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 709  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 710  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	12	15	4.40	776/1649	4.39	4.10	4.28	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	13	4.17	999/1648	4.06	3.92	4.23	4.16	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	13	12	4.23	823/1375	4.02	3.82	4.27	4.10	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	12	4.13	970/1595	4.12	4.01	4.20	4.03	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	10	12	4.07	768/1533	3.95	3.53	4.04	3.87	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	10	11	3.97	938/1512	3.93	3.86	4.10	3.86	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	13	13	4.27	803/1623	4.17	3.98	4.16	4.08	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1646	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	14	4	3.92	1045/1621	3.82	3.89	4.06	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	12	15	4.45	930/1568	4.34	4.17	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	690/1572	4.75	4.64	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	10	9	3.96	1163/1564	3.80	3.85	4.28	4.20	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	10	5	13	4.00	1121/1559	3.98	3.85	4.29	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	8	11	8	3.89	824/1352	4.01	3.81	3.98	3.86	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	10	14	4.36	592/1384	4.22	3.99	4.08	3.86	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	4	7	8	7	3.59	1179/1382	3.78	3.65	4.29	4.03	3.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	6	8	10	3.89	1039/1368	3.64	3.73	4.30	4.01	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	11	0	0	7	6	3	3.75	601/ 948	3.76	3.63	3.95	3.75	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	****/ 221	****	4.05	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 243	****	3.94	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 212	****	3.73	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.02	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	345/ 555	4.53	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 88	3.69	3.69	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 85	3.92	3.92	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/ 81	3.15	3.15	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 92	3.38	3.38	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	197/ 288	3.62	3.91	3.68	3.54	3.44	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	2	10	0	3.83	181/ 312	3.92	3.87	3.68	3.51	3.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0101  
 Title: INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 710  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	30
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 711  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	12	13	4.37	816/1649	4.39	4.10	4.28	4.11	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	11	9	3.96	1166/1648	4.06	3.92	4.23	4.16	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	9	8	3.81	1081/1375	4.02	3.82	4.27	4.10	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	15	7	4.12	996/1595	4.12	4.01	4.20	4.03	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	0	5	9	7	3.83	996/1533	3.95	3.53	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	11	8	3.88	1035/1512	3.93	3.86	4.10	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	4	13	4.07	994/1623	4.17	3.98	4.16	4.08	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	266/1646	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	7	10	3	3.71	1225/1621	3.82	3.89	4.06	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	5	15	4.22	1145/1568	4.34	4.17	4.43	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	7	19	4.63	1121/1572	4.75	4.64	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	6	8	8	3.63	1352/1564	3.80	3.85	4.28	4.20	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	8	11	3.96	1151/1559	3.98	3.85	4.29	4.20	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	6	5	12	4.13	616/1352	4.01	3.81	3.98	3.86	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	7	14	4.07	771/1384	4.22	3.99	4.08	3.86	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	7	6	12	3.96	980/1382	3.78	3.65	4.29	4.03	3.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	2	8	4	8	3.38	1212/1368	3.64	3.73	4.30	4.01	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	1	6	3	7	3.78	591/ 948	3.76	3.63	3.95	3.75	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 221	****	4.05	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 243	****	3.94	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 212	****	3.73	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.02	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	252/ 555	4.53	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	3	3	2	5	3.69	84/ 88	3.69	3.69	4.54	4.31	3.69	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	74/ 85	3.92	3.92	4.47	4.30	3.92	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	5	0	1	2	5	3.15	79/ 81	3.15	3.15	4.43	4.39	3.15	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	84/ 92	3.38	3.38	4.35	4.01	3.38	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	167/ 288	3.62	3.91	3.68	3.54	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	7	2	4.00	68/ 312	3.92	3.87	3.68	3.51	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ENES 101Y 0102  
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 711  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - 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: ROSENFELD, MICH  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 712  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	3	10	4.44	736/1649	4.44	4.10	4.28	4.29	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1197/1648	3.94	3.92	4.23	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	2	6	3.93	1008/1375	3.93	3.82	4.27	4.37	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.01	4.20	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	5	1	3	3.08	1428/1533	3.08	3.53	4.04	4.04	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	595/1512	4.33	3.86	4.10	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	1149/1623	3.93	3.98	4.16	4.21	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	465/1646	4.93	4.97	4.69	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	731/1621	4.21	3.89	4.06	4.01	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	1	5	7	3.88	1358/1568	3.88	4.17	4.43	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1046/1572	4.69	4.64	4.70	4.73	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	1064/1564	4.13	3.85	4.28	4.27	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	966/1559	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	1	5	5	3.67	970/1352	3.67	3.81	3.98	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	613/1384	4.33	3.99	4.08	3.99	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	706/1382	4.42	3.65	4.29	4.19	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.73	4.30	4.21	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	334/ 948	4.27	3.63	3.95	3.89	4.27	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.94	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	3.73	4.40	4.62	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.33	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	3.69	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	3.92	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	3.15	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.38	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	3.91	3.68	3.65	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	36/ 312	4.40	3.87	3.68	3.59	4.40	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	

Course-Section: ENES 200 0101  
 Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS  
 Instructor: ROSENFELD, MICH  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 712  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						