

Course-Section: ENES 101 02
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Spence, Anne M
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 603
 JUN 28, 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	3	6	4.50	585/1447	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	805/1447	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.30	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	658/1241	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	494/1402	4.11	4.17	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	529/1358	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	748/1316	3.88	3.99	4.14	3.99	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	283/1427	4.44	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	309/1434	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.73	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	528/1387	4.82	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	811/1386	4.17	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	420/1380	4.45	4.51	4.32	4.31	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	395/1193	4.31	4.33	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	872/1172	3.85	4.04	4.15	3.95	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1124/1182	3.66	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1088/1170	3.85	3.99	4.38	4.17	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	562/ 800	3.70	3.75	4.06	3.95	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	113/ 189	4.33	4.33	4.34	4.18	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 192	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	71/ 186	4.67	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.67	4.20	4.29	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENES 101 2
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Spence, Anne M
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 604
 JUN 28, 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	0	4	4	4.50	585/1447	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	478/1241	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	494/1402	4.11	4.17	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	799/1358	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	939/1316	3.88	3.99	4.14	3.99	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	319/1427	4.44	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	600/1434	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.73	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	4.82	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	971/1386	4.17	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	4.45	4.51	4.32	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	288/1193	4.31	4.33	4.02	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1172	3.85	4.04	4.15	3.95	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	553/1182	3.66	3.80	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1170	3.85	3.99	4.38	4.17	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	537/ 800	3.70	3.75	4.06	3.95	3.86

Frequency Distribution

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

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	3	0	1	0	5	8	9	4.04	1037/1447	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	6	6	10	4.09	1005/1447	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.30	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	666/1241	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	2	7	10	3.96	1026/1402	4.11	4.17	4.24	4.15	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	7	9	3.83	973/1358	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.03	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	12	4	3.70	1032/1316	3.88	3.99	4.14	3.99	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	668/1427	4.44	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	868/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	16	3	4.10	797/1434	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	611/1387	4.73	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	1018/1387	4.82	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	979/1386	4.17	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	775/1380	4.45	4.51	4.32	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	376/1193	4.31	4.33	4.02	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	6	9	4	3.62	952/1172	3.85	4.04	4.15	3.95	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	7	5	8	3.90	941/1182	3.66	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	7	5	8	3.95	902/1170	3.85	3.99	4.38	4.17	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	588/ 800	3.70	3.75	4.06	3.95	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 189	4.33	4.33	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 192	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 186	4.67	4.67	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 168	4.67	4.67	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 4
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Spence, Anne M
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 605
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	10	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 5
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Spence, Anne M
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 606
 JUN 28, 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	5	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1238/1447	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.18	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	911/1447	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.30	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	798/1241	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	4	5	6	6	3.67	1203/1402	4.11	4.17	4.24	4.15	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	6	5	7	3.85	952/1358	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.03	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	2	4	1	5	6	3.50	1134/1316	3.88	3.99	4.14	3.99	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	596/1427	4.44	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	938/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1017/1434	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	656/1387	4.73	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	946/1387	4.82	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1006/1386	4.17	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	940/1380	4.45	4.51	4.32	4.31	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	463/1193	4.31	4.33	4.02	3.99	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	3	2	5	3	3.00	1090/1172	3.85	4.04	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	6	4	0	4	2.76	1156/1182	3.66	3.80	4.35	4.18	2.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	4	5	1	4	2.94	1140/1170	3.85	3.99	4.38	4.17	2.94
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	763/ 800	3.70	3.75	4.06	3.95	2.90
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

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	3	9	4.62	463/1447	4.29	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	1053/1447	4.26	4.29	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	8	4.15	850/1241	4.35	4.40	4.33	4.25	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1056/1402	4.11	4.17	4.24	4.15	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	700/1358	4.03	4.01	4.11	4.03	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	617/1316	3.88	3.99	4.14	3.99	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	874/1427	4.44	4.38	4.19	4.24	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1447	4.82	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1238/1434	4.06	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	414/1387	4.73	4.71	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	681/1387	4.82	4.85	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	962/1386	4.17	4.26	4.32	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	0	9	4.23	905/1380	4.45	4.51	4.32	4.31	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	652/1193	4.31	4.33	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	672/1172	3.85	4.04	4.15	3.95	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	941/1182	3.66	3.80	4.35	4.18	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	804/1170	3.85	3.99	4.38	4.17	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	351/ 800	3.70	3.75	4.06	3.95	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	4.33	4.33	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	4.67	4.67	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	4.67	4.67	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.67	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 6
 Title Intro Engineering Sci
 Instructor: Spence, Anne M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 607
 JUN 28, 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	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 200 1
 Title Intro To Entrepreneurs
 Instructor: Rosenfeld,Micha
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 608
 JUN 28, 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	0	0	3	12	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.38	4.31	4.31	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	590/1447	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.23	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.40	4.33	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.17	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	938/1358	3.88	4.01	4.11	4.12	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	392/1316	4.50	3.99	4.14	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	931/1427	4.07	4.38	4.19	4.14	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	442/1434	4.42	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.71	4.46	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.26	4.32	4.24	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	376/1193	4.40	4.33	4.02	4.04	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.04	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	553/1182	4.50	3.80	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	480/1170	4.67	3.99	4.38	4.32	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.75	4.06	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors		4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		1				
				?	0							