

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 630
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1473/1504	2.83	4.24	4.27	4.13	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	2	0	2	2.86	1445/1503	2.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1279/1290	2.90	4.32	4.28	4.19	2.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	3	0	1	2.43	1445/1453	2.94	4.22	4.21	4.11	2.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1305/1421	2.97	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1344/1365	2.90	4.11	4.08	3.96	2.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1387/1485	2.97	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1461/1483	2.70	4.07	4.06	3.97	2.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1402/1425	2.89	4.41	4.41	4.36	2.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1388/1426	3.68	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1320/1418	2.87	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1312/1416	2.81	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1189/1199	2.03	3.95	3.97	3.82	1.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	1277/1312	2.64	4.12	4.00	3.69	2.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1241/1303	2.83	4.39	4.24	3.93	2.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1254/1299	2.70	4.34	4.25	3.94	2.43
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	746/ 758	3.04	4.05	4.01	3.80	2.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	2.20	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	2.80	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	2.75	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	3.25	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	2.75	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	2.50	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	3.00	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	35	2.50	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	36	2.50	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 0101
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 630
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 631
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	2	3	2	3	3.00	1453/1504	2.83	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	4	2	3.38	1353/1503	2.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	1	3	3.15	1226/1290	2.90	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1348/1453	2.94	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	0	3	2.85	1350/1421	2.97	4.08	4.00	3.91	2.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	2	3	2	3.00	1296/1365	2.90	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	3	0	5	3.15	1368/1485	2.97	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1022/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	1	4	0	2.78	1420/1483	2.70	4.07	4.06	3.97	2.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	2	1	4	3.25	1346/1425	2.89	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1290/1426	3.68	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1266/1418	2.87	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	1318/1416	2.81	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1027/1199	2.03	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	6	2	0	2.64	1228/1312	2.64	4.12	4.00	3.69	2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	1	2	3	3.09	1191/1303	2.83	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	1194/1299	2.70	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	508/ 758	3.04	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	225/ 233	2.20	4.07	4.09	3.90	2.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	233/ 244	2.80	4.12	4.09	4.07	2.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	226/ 227	2.75	4.49	4.40	4.24	2.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	59/ 67	3.25	4.32	4.34	3.88	3.25
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	54/ 58	2.75	3.98	4.43	3.63	2.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	50/ 56	2.50	4.12	4.23	4.11	2.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	37/ 40	3.00	4.28	4.53	4.52	3.00

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	35/	35	2.50	4.43	4.49	4.65	2.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	36/	36	2.50	4.38	4.60	4.48	2.50
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 0102
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 631
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0103
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 632
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	2	3	0	0	2.14	1499/1504	2.83	4.24	4.27	4.13	2.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	1	0	0	1.57	1498/1503	2.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	1.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	1288/1290	2.90	4.32	4.28	4.19	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1446/1453	2.94	4.22	4.21	4.11	2.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1391/1421	2.97	4.08	4.00	3.91	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.90	4.11	4.08	3.96	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	0	1	0	2.00	1477/1485	2.97	4.20	4.16	4.13	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	778/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1480/1483	2.70	4.07	4.06	3.97	1.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	2	0	0	2.17	1413/1425	2.89	4.41	4.41	4.36	2.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	1402/1426	3.68	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	1414/1418	2.87	4.29	4.25	4.20	1.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1399/1416	2.81	4.34	4.26	4.21	2.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	1196/1199	2.03	3.95	3.97	3.82	1.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1272/1312	2.64	4.12	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	1275/1303	2.83	4.39	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1244/1299	2.70	4.34	4.25	3.94	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	728/ 758	3.04	4.05	4.01	3.80	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	2.20	4.07	4.09	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0201
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 633
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1420/1504	2.83	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	3	4	2	2	2.92	1434/1503	2.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	1	5	1	4	3.31	1202/1290	2.90	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1385/1453	2.94	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	1	5	2	3.15	1273/1421	2.97	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1113/1365	2.90	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	4	4	1	3	3.08	1380/1485	2.97	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1041/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1370/1483	2.70	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	3	1	3	2	2.83	1394/1425	2.89	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1356/1426	3.68	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	0	3	3	2	2.92	1351/1418	2.87	4.29	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	1319/1416	2.81	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	3	2	1	1	0	2.00	1181/1199	2.03	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	2	1	3	3.10	1131/1312	2.64	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	2	0	4	3.30	1159/1303	2.83	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	1227/1299	2.70	4.34	4.25	3.94	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	680/ 758	3.04	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 233	2.20	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 244	2.80	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 227	2.75	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 67	3.25	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 58	2.75	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 56	2.50	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 40	3.00	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/	35	2.50	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/	36	2.50	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 0201
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 633
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0201
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 634
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1420/1504	2.83	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	3	4	2	2	2.92	1434/1503	2.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	1	5	1	4	3.31	1202/1290	2.90	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1385/1453	2.94	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	1	5	2	3.15	1273/1421	2.97	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1113/1365	2.90	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	4	4	1	3	3.08	1380/1485	2.97	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1041/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1340/1483	2.70	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1356/1425	2.89	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1426	3.68	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1418	2.87	4.29	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1416	2.81	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	2.03	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	2	1	3	3.10	1131/1312	2.64	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	2	0	4	3.30	1159/1303	2.83	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	1227/1299	2.70	4.34	4.25	3.94	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	680/ 758	3.04	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 233	2.20	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 244	2.80	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 227	2.75	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 67	3.25	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 58	2.75	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 56	2.50	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 40	3.00	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/	35	2.50	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/	36	2.50	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENES 101 0201
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 634
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENES 101 0202
 Title INTRO ENGINEERING SCI
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 635
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	2	3	3	2	0	2.50	1493/1504	2.83	4.24	4.27	4.13	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	6	3	0	2.91	1438/1503	2.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	3	1	3.20	1219/1290	2.90	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	6	3	0	3.20	1377/1453	2.94	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	5	0	3.18	1262/1421	2.97	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	5	0	0	2.63	1341/1365	2.90	4.11	4.08	3.96	2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1284/1485	2.97	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1014/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1340/1483	2.70	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1356/1425	2.89	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1364/1426	3.68	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1330/1418	2.87	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1373/1416	2.81	4.34	4.26	4.21	2.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1172/1199	2.03	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	1261/1312	2.64	4.12	4.00	3.69	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	1233/1303	2.83	4.39	4.24	3.93	2.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	4	3	2	0	2.60	1244/1299	2.70	4.34	4.25	3.94	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	580/ 758	3.04	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	2.20	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	2.80	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	2.75	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 12 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 110 0101
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 636
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	594/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	618/1503	4.47	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	230/1290	4.73	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	3	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	775/1453	4.04	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	4	0	2	4	7	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.77	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	9	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	645/1365	4.18	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	1	10	7	4.21	806/1485	4.27	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1051/1483	3.92	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	8	10	4.37	940/1425	4.48	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	940/1426	4.66	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1102/1418	4.05	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	904/1416	4.21	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	5	4	9	4.22	519/1199	4.14	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	2	5	5	3	3.05	1140/1312	3.09	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	3	6	5	2	3.00	1195/1303	3.04	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	3	4	3	3	2.78	1230/1299	3.05	4.34	4.25	3.94	2.78
4. Were special techniques successful	8	15	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0	Under-grad	25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	19

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENES 110 0102
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 637
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	700/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	472/1503	4.47	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	333/1290	4.73	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	1155/1453	4.04	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	815/1421	3.77	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	681/1365	4.18	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	7	14	4.32	682/1485	4.27	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	850/1483	3.92	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	688/1425	4.48	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	995/1426	4.66	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	905/1418	4.05	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	11	4.20	921/1416	4.21	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	618/1199	4.14	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	3	4	6	5	3.13	1124/1312	3.09	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	6	6	2	6	3.09	1191/1303	3.04	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	3	8	4	5	3.32	1157/1299	3.05	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.32
4. Were special techniques successful	3	20	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 110 0103
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 638
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.13	****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1503	4.47	4.22	4.20	4.16	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	4.73	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1421	3.77	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1485	4.27	4.20	4.16	4.13	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1483	3.92	4.07	4.06	3.97	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	4.48	4.41	4.41	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	4.66	4.72	4.69	4.56	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1418	4.05	4.29	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	4.21	4.34	4.26	4.21	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.14	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1312	3.09	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1303	3.04	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1299	3.05	4.34	4.25	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 110 0104
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 639
 JUN 14, 2005
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENES 200 0101
 Title INTRO TO ENTREPRENEURS
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 640
 JUN 14, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1503	4.89	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	152/1290	4.88	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENES 221 0101
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 641
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	26	0	1	3	12	7	6	3.48	1360/1504	3.48	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	26	0	4	6	7	10	2	3.00	1419/1503	3.00	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	25	0	4	12	8	5	1	2.57	1274/1290	2.57	4.32	4.28	4.27	2.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	25	13	1	3	5	6	2	3.29	1357/1453	3.29	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	26	6	6	2	5	6	4	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	26	10	2	4	4	4	5	3.32	1232/1365	3.32	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	0	8	1	11	4	5	2.90	1411/1485	2.90	4.20	4.16	4.15	2.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	26	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	0	4	7	8	5	0	2.58	1440/1483	2.58	4.07	4.06	4.02	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	2	6	5	10	6	3.41	1326/1425	3.41	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	2	2	11	14	4.28	1260/1426	4.28	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	4	9	10	6	0	2.62	1385/1418	2.62	4.29	4.25	4.22	2.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	10	3	9	6	1	2.48	1380/1416	2.48	4.34	4.26	4.24	2.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	19	5	2	0	2	1	2.20	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	10	3	4	2	1	2.05	1286/1312	2.05	4.12	4.00	3.98	2.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	12	1	4	0	2	1.89	1285/1303	1.89	4.39	4.24	4.23	1.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	5	6	6	0	1	2.22	1265/1299	2.22	4.34	4.25	4.21	2.22
4. Were special techniques successful	37	17	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 9		
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 6	Other	29

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant