

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: SU, HAIJUN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 801
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 3.21 | 1575/1639 | 3.11 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 3.21 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 3.16 | 1569/1639 | 2.68 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.16 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3.56 | 1258/1397 | 3.33 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 3.56 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3.67 | 1324/1583 | 3.48 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2.47 | 1504/1532 | 2.09 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 2.47 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 3.44 | 1240/1504 | 3.11 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 3.44 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2.90 | 1548/1612 | 2.95 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 2.90 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 4.74 | 913/1635 | 4.87 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 4.74 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 2.88 | 1516/1579 | 2.55 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 2.88 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3.90 | 1318/1518 | 3.70 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 3.90 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 4.20 | 1377/1520 | 4.15 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.20 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3.00 | 1453/1517 | 2.78 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3.40 | 1368/1550 | 2.87 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 3.40 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3.67 | 894/1295 | 3.27 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 3.67 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3.64 | 1052/1398 | 3.64 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.14 | 3.64 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3.00 | 1321/1391 | 3.00 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 3.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2.91 | 1342/1388 | 2.91 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 2.91 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 841/ 958 | 3.00 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.00 | 3.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3.75 | 175/ 224 | 4.13 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 3.75 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4.00 | 148/ 240 | 3.90 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.47 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.25 | 209/ 219 | 3.25 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.61 | 3.25 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4.00 | 158/ 215 | 4.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.43 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 12 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.20 | 188/ 198 | 3.40 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.08 | 3.20 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 9 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | B 5 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | D 1 | | Under-grad 20 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 18 |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: SU, HAIJUN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 802
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.00 | 1599/1639 | 3.11 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.35 | 3.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.20 | 1636/1639 | 2.68 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 2.20 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.10 | 1353/1397 | 3.33 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.39 | 3.10 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.30 | 1472/1583 | 3.48 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.28 | 3.30 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1.71 | 1530/1532 | 2.09 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.09 | 1.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2.78 | 1452/1504 | 3.11 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.09 | 2.78 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.00 | 1519/1612 | 2.95 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 3.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.87 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.63 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2.22 | 1567/1579 | 2.55 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.14 | 2.22 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3.50 | 1419/1518 | 3.70 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.48 | 3.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4.10 | 1397/1520 | 4.15 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.78 | 4.10 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2.56 | 1498/1517 | 2.78 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 2.56 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2.33 | 1505/1550 | 2.87 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.33 | 2.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2.88 | 1203/1295 | 3.27 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.07 | 2.88 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1398 | 3.64 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.14 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1391 | 3.00 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1388 | 2.91 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.37 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 958 | 3.00 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.00 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 51/ 224 | 4.13 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.33 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3.80 | 182/ 240 | 3.90 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.47 | 3.80 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.25 | 209/ 219 | 3.25 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.61 | 3.25 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 158/ 215 | 4.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.43 | 4.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 168/ 198 | 3.40 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.08 | 3.60 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | 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 | 9 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101
 Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 100
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 803
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 61 | 4.54 | 582/1639 | 4.54 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.54 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 16 | 57 | 4.46 | 583/1639 | 4.46 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.46 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 57 | 4.41 | 646/1397 | 4.41 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.41 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 6 | 22 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 36 | 4.28 | 761/1583 | 4.28 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.28 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 4 | 20 | 1 | 2 | 18 | 22 | 21 | 3.94 | 869/1532 | 3.94 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.94 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 4 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 38 | 4.40 | 498/1504 | 4.40 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.40 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 60 | 4.54 | 459/1612 | 4.54 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.54 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 80 | 4.95 | 331/1635 | 4.95 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.95 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 51 | 4.58 | 312/1579 | 4.58 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.58 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 70 | 4.80 | 360/1518 | 4.80 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 77 | 4.88 | 622/1520 | 4.88 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 17 | 56 | 4.56 | 523/1517 | 4.56 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 65 | 4.70 | 414/1550 | 4.70 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.70 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 9 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 56 | 4.60 | 221/1295 | 4.60 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.60 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 78 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.00 | ****/1398 | **** | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 78 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4.20 | ****/1391 | **** | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 78 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.40 | ****/1388 | **** | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 78 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 2 | A 26 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate 0 Major 75 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 45 | | |
| 56-83 | 13 | 2.00-2.99 20 | C 5 | General 0 | Under-grad 88 Non-major 13 |
| 84-150 | 28 | 3.00-3.49 14 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 19 | F 0 | Electives 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other 75 | |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Course-Section: ENME 301H 0101
 Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 804
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 890/1639 | 4.25 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.63 | 1432/1639 | 3.63 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.63 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.80 | 1151/1397 | 3.80 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.80 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.88 | 1178/1583 | 3.88 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.88 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.57 | 1201/1532 | 3.57 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.57 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.63 | 1141/1504 | 3.63 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.63 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.38 | 669/1612 | 4.38 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.38 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 884/1635 | 4.75 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.75 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 312/1579 | 4.57 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 1094/1518 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.50 | 1188/1520 | 4.50 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 886/1517 | 4.25 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 897/1550 | 4.25 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.25 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3.75 | 838/1295 | 3.75 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.75 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 5.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 224 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 240 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 219 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 215 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 198 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 5.00 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 52/ 85 | 4.50 | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.50 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | A 4 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | B 2 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 1 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 8 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |
| | | | | Other | 6 |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 805
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3.26 | 1563/1639 | 3.35 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.26 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 4.21 | 895/1639 | 4.16 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.21 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 4 | 4.58 | 447/1397 | 4.57 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.58 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | 771/1583 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.27 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3.00 | 1421/1532 | 3.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.15 | 713/1504 | 4.15 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.15 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.37 | 681/1612 | 4.40 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.37 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 397/1635 | 4.98 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.95 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 3.24 | 1427/1579 | 3.25 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.12 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4.50 | 807/1518 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 3.50 | 1492/1520 | 3.61 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.50 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 3.83 | 1223/1517 | 3.62 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.83 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3.72 | 1250/1550 | 3.30 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.72 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3.50 | 978/1295 | 3.33 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2.71 | 1336/1398 | 2.71 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 2.71 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2.86 | 1354/1391 | 2.77 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 2.86 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2.86 | 1346/1388 | 2.87 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 2.86 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 958 | 3.60 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3.00 | 207/ 224 | 3.17 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.67 | 195/ 240 | 3.38 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.67 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 173/ 219 | 3.92 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.13 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.50 | 196/ 215 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 3.50 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4.00 | 129/ 198 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 4.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 806
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3.26 | 1563/1639 | 3.35 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.26 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 4.21 | 895/1639 | 4.16 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.21 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 4 | 4.58 | 447/1397 | 4.57 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.58 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.27 | 771/1583 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.27 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3.00 | 1421/1532 | 3.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.15 | 713/1504 | 4.15 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.15 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.37 | 681/1612 | 4.40 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.37 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 397/1635 | 4.98 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.95 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1477/1579 | 3.25 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.12 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | ****/1518 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/1520 | 3.61 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.50 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | ****/1517 | 3.62 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.83 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | ****/1550 | 3.30 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.72 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1295 | 3.33 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2.71 | 1336/1398 | 2.71 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 2.71 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 12 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2.86 | 1354/1391 | 2.77 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 2.86 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2.86 | 1346/1388 | 2.87 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 2.86 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 12 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 958 | 3.60 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3.00 | 207/ 224 | 3.17 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.67 | 195/ 240 | 3.38 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.67 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 173/ 219 | 3.92 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.13 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.50 | 196/ 215 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 3.50 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4.00 | 129/ 198 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 4.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 17 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 11 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 19 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 303 0102
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 807
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.38 | 1536/1639 | 3.35 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.38 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.25 | 859/1639 | 4.16 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 282/1397 | 4.57 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 476/1583 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.57 | 1201/1532 | 3.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.57 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 313/1504 | 4.15 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.57 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 218/1612 | 4.40 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.75 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.98 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.57 | 1284/1579 | 3.25 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 656/1518 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.63 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3.88 | 1447/1520 | 3.61 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.88 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 3.62 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.63 | 1289/1550 | 3.30 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.63 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.63 | 917/1295 | 3.33 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.63 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.25 | 1207/1398 | 2.71 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.25 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.75 | 1364/1391 | 2.77 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 2.75 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.25 | 1270/1388 | 2.87 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 3.25 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 958 | 3.60 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 207/ 224 | 3.17 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | 231/ 240 | 3.38 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 2.50 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 207/ 219 | 3.92 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 3.50 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 158/ 215 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 184/ 198 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 3.33 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 7 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 1 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 8 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 0 | Other | 7 |

Course-Section: ENME 303 0103
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 808
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3.06 | 1594/1639 | 3.35 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.06 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.00 | 1090/1639 | 4.16 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 4.56 | 457/1397 | 4.57 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.67 | 1136/1532 | 3.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.67 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.67 | 1116/1504 | 4.15 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4.31 | 743/1612 | 4.40 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.31 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.98 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3.43 | 1354/1579 | 3.25 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.43 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.00 | 1237/1518 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3.71 | 1472/1520 | 3.61 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.71 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3.33 | 1405/1517 | 3.62 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.33 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2.87 | 1467/1550 | 3.30 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 2.87 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2.91 | 1200/1295 | 3.33 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 2.91 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2.73 | 1335/1398 | 2.71 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 2.73 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2.55 | 1375/1391 | 2.77 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 2.55 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2.91 | 1342/1388 | 2.87 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 2.91 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.20 | 818/ 958 | 3.60 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.20 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | ****/ 224 | 3.17 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | ****/ 240 | 3.38 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 219 | 3.92 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | ****/ 215 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 198 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 11 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 5 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 18 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 15 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: ENME 303 0104
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 809
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3.80 | 1326/1639 | 3.35 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | 1003/1639 | 4.16 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.11 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 661/1397 | 4.57 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.40 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.86 | 1192/1583 | 4.18 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.86 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.67 | 1136/1532 | 3.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.67 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 667/1504 | 4.15 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.20 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4.22 | 848/1612 | 4.40 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.22 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.98 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1477/1579 | 3.25 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3.89 | 1324/1518 | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 3.89 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | 1504/1520 | 3.61 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.33 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.33 | 1405/1517 | 3.62 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 3.33 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.00 | 1440/1550 | 3.30 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 3.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.29 | 1089/1295 | 3.33 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.29 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.17 | 1379/1398 | 2.71 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 2.17 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2.83 | 1356/1391 | 2.77 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 2.83 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.50 | 1371/1388 | 2.87 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 2.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 456/ 958 | 3.60 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | 4.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | 186/ 224 | 3.17 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 3.67 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | 195/ 240 | 3.38 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 3.67 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | 3.92 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 158/ 215 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 198 | 3.78 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 810
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2.63 | 1626/1639 | 2.63 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 2.63 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 2.22 | 1635/1639 | 2.22 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 2.22 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2.85 | 1383/1397 | 2.85 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 2.85 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 2.70 | 1571/1583 | 2.70 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 2.70 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1.57 | 1531/1532 | 1.57 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 1.57 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2.43 | 1483/1504 | 2.43 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 2.43 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 2.12 | 1594/1612 | 2.12 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 2.12 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 4.36 | 1265/1635 | 4.36 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.36 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2.04 | 1572/1579 | 2.04 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 2.04 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2.15 | 1510/1518 | 2.15 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 2.15 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 3.23 | 1508/1520 | 3.23 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.23 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 2.04 | 1510/1517 | 2.04 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 2.04 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2.50 | 1491/1550 | 2.50 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 2.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/1295 | **** | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.25 | ****/1398 | **** | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1391 | **** | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1388 | **** | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 10 | Required for Majors 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 12 | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C 1 | General 0 |
| 84-150 | 13 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | D 0 | Under-grad 27 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F 0 | Non-major 4 |
| | | | | P 0 | |
| | | | | I 0 | |
| | | | | ? 1 | Other 23 |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101
 Title FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: CARMI, SHLOMO
 Enrollment: 98
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 811
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 14 | 18 | 15 | 9 | 3.22 | 1573/1639 | 3.22 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.22 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 2.88 | 1607/1639 | 2.88 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 2.88 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 7 | 3.12 | 1349/1397 | 3.12 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 3.12 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 25 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 3.12 | 1515/1583 | 3.12 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.12 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 13 | 24 | 8 | 3.51 | 1241/1532 | 3.51 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.51 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 20 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 3.47 | 1226/1504 | 3.47 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.47 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 21 | 13 | 14 | 3.45 | 1424/1612 | 3.45 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.45 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2.68 | 1539/1579 | 2.68 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 2.68 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 18 | 18 | 11 | 3.46 | 1428/1518 | 3.46 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 3.46 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 3.42 | 1498/1520 | 3.42 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 3.42 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 9 | 21 | 16 | 7 | 3 | 2.54 | 1499/1517 | 2.54 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 2.54 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 22 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 2.37 | 1503/1550 | 2.37 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 2.37 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 20 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 2.59 | 1239/1295 | 2.59 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 2.59 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 54 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.20 | ****/1398 | **** | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 54 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.20 | ****/1391 | **** | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 54 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3.20 | ****/1388 | **** | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 54 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 1 | A 12 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 26 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 11 | 2.00-2.99 9 | C 13 | General | 59 |
| 84-150 | 27 | 3.00-3.49 17 | D 0 | | Major 5 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 19 | F 0 | Electives | |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 3 | Other | 53 |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101
 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES
 Instructor: SALLOUM, MAHER
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 812
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 6 | 5 | 4.14 | 1016/1639 | 4.14 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.14 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 650/1639 | 4.43 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.43 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 4.50 | 517/1397 | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4.38 | 625/1583 | 4.38 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.38 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 430/1532 | 4.42 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 4.42 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3.75 | 1051/1504 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 3.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.54 | 459/1612 | 4.54 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.54 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 884/1635 | 4.75 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 4.75 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 601/1579 | 4.30 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.30 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.57 | 720/1518 | 4.57 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 961/1520 | 4.71 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.71 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4.29 | 854/1517 | 4.29 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.29 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.50 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 4.07 | 590/1295 | 4.07 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.07 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.29 | 599/1398 | 4.29 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 4.29 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.29 | 793/1391 | 4.29 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.29 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 721/1388 | 4.43 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.43 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 813
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.15 | 1003/1639 | 4.28 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.15 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.31 | 813/1639 | 4.39 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.31 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 4.23 | 813/1397 | 4.30 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.23 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 3.95 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.70 | 1104/1532 | 3.64 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.70 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.33 | 544/1504 | 4.40 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3.92 | 1148/1612 | 4.00 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.92 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.33 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.25 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.33 | 1021/1518 | 4.41 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.17 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 437/1520 | 4.81 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.96 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4.08 | 1042/1517 | 4.24 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.24 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.15 | 982/1550 | 4.37 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.38 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2.86 | 1206/1295 | 2.43 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 2.86 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.60 | 1074/1398 | 3.65 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.60 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 752/1391 | 4.31 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 783/1388 | 4.31 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.33 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 71/ 224 | 4.31 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.42 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.25 | 125/ 240 | 4.29 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 136/ 219 | 4.64 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.42 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3.92 | 178/ 215 | 3.78 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 3.92 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3.50 | 170/ 198 | 3.67 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 3.50 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | 5.00 | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 813
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 7 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 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 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 814
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4.15 | 1003/1639 | 4.28 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.15 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.31 | 813/1639 | 4.39 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.31 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 4.23 | 813/1397 | 4.30 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.23 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 3.95 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.70 | 1104/1532 | 3.64 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.70 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.33 | 544/1504 | 4.40 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3.92 | 1148/1612 | 4.00 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.92 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 382/1579 | 4.33 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.25 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1237/1518 | 4.41 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.17 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 4.81 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.96 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 726/1517 | 4.24 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.24 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 522/1550 | 4.37 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.38 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1295 | 2.43 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 2.86 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.60 | 1074/1398 | 3.65 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.60 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 752/1391 | 4.31 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 783/1388 | 4.31 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.33 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 3.97 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 71/ 224 | 4.31 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.42 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.25 | 125/ 240 | 4.29 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.42 | 136/ 219 | 4.64 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.42 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3.92 | 178/ 215 | 3.78 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 3.92 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3.50 | 170/ 198 | 3.67 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 3.50 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.60 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.65 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.08 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.31 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.63 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.30 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 5.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | 5.00 | 4.69 | 5.00 | **** | |

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 814
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 11 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 7 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 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 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 815
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 890/1639 | 4.28 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.39 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 282/1397 | 4.30 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 476/1583 | 3.95 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.67 | 1136/1532 | 3.64 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.67 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 367/1504 | 4.40 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.50 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4.50 | 490/1612 | 4.00 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 4.50 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 473/1579 | 4.33 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.43 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 454/1518 | 4.41 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 622/1520 | 4.81 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 597/1517 | 4.24 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.63 | 500/1550 | 4.37 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.63 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1273/1295 | 2.43 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 2.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1398 | 3.65 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1391 | 4.31 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1388 | 4.31 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 99/ 224 | 4.31 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 125/ 240 | 4.29 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 219 | 4.64 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 207/ 215 | 3.78 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 3.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 98/ 198 | 3.67 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 4.25 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|----------|---|-------|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 1 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 7 | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 8 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 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 | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 816
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 561/1639 | 4.28 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 617/1639 | 4.39 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.44 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.30 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.29 | 1477/1583 | 3.95 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.24 | 3.29 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 1241/1532 | 3.64 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.05 | 3.50 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 441/1504 | 4.40 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.12 | 4.44 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.67 | 1327/1612 | 4.00 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.12 | 3.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.66 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 527/1579 | 4.33 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 4.38 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 745/1518 | 4.41 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.56 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4.44 | 1239/1520 | 4.81 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.68 | 4.44 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 4.24 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.23 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4.11 | 1019/1550 | 4.37 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.11 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/1295 | 2.43 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.75 | 965/1398 | 3.65 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.13 | 3.75 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 816/1391 | 4.31 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.35 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 834/1388 | 4.31 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.34 | 4.25 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 111/ 224 | 4.31 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.14 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 98/ 240 | 4.29 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.43 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 79/ 219 | 4.64 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 4.71 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 132/ 215 | 3.78 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.21 | 4.29 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3.43 | 176/ 198 | 3.67 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.04 | 3.43 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|----------|---|-------|-------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 3 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 3 | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major 3 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | 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 | 7 | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL
 Enrollment: 90
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 817
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 19 | 30 | 4.14 | 1029/1639 | 4.14 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.14 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 20 | 35 | 4.35 | 748/1639 | 4.35 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.35 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 41 | 4.47 | 574/1397 | 4.47 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.47 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 19 | 27 | 4.12 | 929/1583 | 4.12 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.12 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 6 | 33 | 4.23 | 607/1532 | 4.23 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.23 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 12 | 26 | 3.98 | 848/1504 | 3.98 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.98 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 21 | 35 | 4.38 | 669/1612 | 4.38 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.38 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 43 | 4.69 | 979/1635 | 4.69 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.69 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 12 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 19 | 9 | 3.61 | 1270/1579 | 3.61 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.61 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 19 | 37 | 4.44 | 905/1518 | 4.44 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.44 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 22 | 31 | 4.23 | 1363/1520 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.23 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 22 | 24 | 4.02 | 1077/1517 | 4.02 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.02 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 19 | 27 | 3.94 | 1135/1550 | 3.94 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.94 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 3.31 | 1076/1295 | 3.31 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.31 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 56 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3.60 | ****/1398 | **** | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 58 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.50 | ****/1391 | **** | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 58 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3.50 | ****/1388 | **** | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 58 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 34 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 23 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 11 | C 3 | General | 0 |
| 84-150 | 42 | 3.00-3.49 21 | D 0 | | Under-grad 66 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 15 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 62 |
| | | | ? 2 | | |

Course-Section: ENME 425 0101
 Title INTERNAL COMBUS ENGINE
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 818
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.17 | 990/1639 | 4.17 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.17 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4.17 | 948/1639 | 4.17 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4.08 | 953/1583 | 4.08 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.08 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 1421/1532 | 3.00 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 3.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3.75 | 1051/1504 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.67 | 1327/1612 | 3.67 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 312/1579 | 4.57 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 643/1518 | 4.64 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.64 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 546/1520 | 4.91 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.91 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3.91 | 1182/1517 | 3.91 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.91 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.18 | 953/1550 | 4.18 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.18 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2.70 | 1225/1295 | 2.70 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 2.70 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 625/1398 | 4.25 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 816/1391 | 4.25 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.85 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---------------|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 2 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 5 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 2 | C 1 | General | 6 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 1 | D 0 | | Under-grad 13 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 1 | F 0 | | Major 7 |
| | | | P 0 | | Non-major 6 |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |
| | | | | Electives | 0 |
| | | | | Other | 2 |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 819
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.85 | 1296/1639 | 3.86 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.85 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 3.31 | 1542/1639 | 3.59 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.31 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1397 | 3.75 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3.69 | 1303/1583 | 3.83 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.69 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1532 | 4.42 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | **** | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4.08 | 786/1504 | 4.30 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.08 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3.23 | 1479/1612 | 3.62 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.23 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3.67 | 1232/1579 | 3.64 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.67 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.23 | 1110/1518 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.23 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 3.85 | 1451/1520 | 3.86 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 3.85 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 4.08 | 1042/1517 | 3.93 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.08 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3.33 | 1385/1550 | 3.07 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.33 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.58 | 938/1295 | 3.59 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.58 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | 1357/1398 | 2.50 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 2.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3.25 | 1281/1391 | 3.25 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 3.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1320/1388 | 3.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 3.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 129/ 224 | 3.96 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 3.38 | 213/ 240 | 3.23 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 3.38 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3.00 | 213/ 219 | 3.57 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 3.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2.50 | 211/ 215 | 2.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 2.50 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2.92 | 195/ 198 | 3.37 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 2.92 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.83 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.56 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.02 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.84 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.58 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.71 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.73 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.64 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 819
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 5 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 13 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 10 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 12 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 820
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 3.86 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3.91 | 1262/1639 | 3.59 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.91 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1397 | 3.75 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | **** | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.10 | 939/1583 | 3.83 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.10 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 506/1532 | 4.42 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.33 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4.64 | 268/1504 | 4.30 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.64 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3.82 | 1245/1612 | 3.62 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.82 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 662/1635 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.90 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3.60 | 1270/1579 | 3.64 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.60 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4.36 | 989/1518 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.36 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1414/1520 | 3.86 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 3.93 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2.80 | 1473/1550 | 3.07 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 2.80 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.78 | 825/1295 | 3.59 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.78 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1398 | 2.50 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1391 | 3.25 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1388 | 3.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4.09 | 118/ 224 | 3.96 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | 4.09 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.40 | 212/ 240 | 3.23 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 3.40 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.70 | 206/ 219 | 3.57 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 3.70 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2.56 | 210/ 215 | 2.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 2.56 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3.50 | 170/ 198 | 3.37 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 3.50 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.83 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.84 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.58 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 10 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 1 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 11 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 821
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3.73 | 1378/1639 | 3.86 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.73 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3.55 | 1466/1639 | 3.59 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.55 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 1175/1397 | 3.75 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 3.75 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.70 | 1296/1583 | 3.83 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.70 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 335/1532 | 4.42 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.50 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 667/1504 | 4.30 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.20 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3.80 | 1253/1612 | 3.62 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.80 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.67 | 1232/1579 | 3.64 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.67 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.36 | 989/1518 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.36 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3.73 | 1470/1520 | 3.86 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 3.73 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.73 | 1272/1517 | 3.93 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.73 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3.09 | 1433/1550 | 3.07 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.09 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.40 | 1035/1295 | 3.59 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.40 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1398 | 2.50 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1391 | 3.25 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1388 | 3.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3.80 | 167/ 224 | 3.96 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2.90 | 226/ 240 | 3.23 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 2.90 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4.00 | 179/ 219 | 3.57 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3.20 | 205/ 215 | 2.75 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 3.20 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3.70 | 162/ 198 | 3.37 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 3.70 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | 5.00 | 4.52 | 4.50 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 4 | Required for Majors 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 5 | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C 0 | General 0 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | Under-grad 12 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F 0 | Non-major 2 |
| | | | | P 0 | |
| | | | | I 0 | |
| | | | | ? 0 | Electives 0 |
| | | | | | Other 10 |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 822
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.25 | 1565/1639 | 3.13 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.25 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.25 | 1553/1639 | 3.13 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.25 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.75 | 1175/1397 | 3.38 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 3.75 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 3.40 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 3.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.29 | 1330/1504 | 3.02 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.29 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 364/1612 | 3.61 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.63 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3.75 | 1589/1635 | 3.96 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 3.75 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.40 | 1364/1579 | 3.37 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.40 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 529/1518 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3.57 | 1487/1520 | 3.39 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 3.57 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3.86 | 1211/1517 | 3.63 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.86 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.50 | 1328/1550 | 3.45 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4.17 | 529/1295 | 3.78 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.17 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 426/1398 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 616/1391 | 3.50 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1388 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 5 | Required for Majors | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 1 | | 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 8 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | 0 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | | |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 444 0102
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 823
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1599/1639 | 3.13 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1579/1639 | 3.13 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1363/1397 | 3.38 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 3.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.80 | 1567/1583 | 3.40 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 2.80 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.75 | 1477/1532 | 3.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 2.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.75 | 1457/1504 | 3.02 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 2.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.60 | 1572/1612 | 3.61 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 2.60 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4.17 | 1415/1635 | 3.96 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.17 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 1390/1579 | 3.37 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.33 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1351/1518 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.20 | 1509/1520 | 3.39 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 3.20 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3.40 | 1384/1517 | 3.63 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.40 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.40 | 1368/1550 | 3.45 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.40 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.40 | 1035/1295 | 3.78 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.40 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1106/1398 | 4.00 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 3.50 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | 1377/1391 | 3.50 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 2.50 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 475 0101
 Title ROBOTICS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 824
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 6 | 23 | 4.73 | 342/1639 | 4.73 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.73 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 24 | 4.70 | 316/1639 | 4.70 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.70 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 26 | 4.80 | 230/1397 | 4.80 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.80 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4.33 | 697/1583 | 4.33 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 3.88 | 926/1532 | 3.88 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 3.88 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 4.10 | 770/1504 | 4.10 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.10 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 23 | 4.63 | 352/1612 | 4.63 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.63 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 2 | 4.03 | 1484/1635 | 4.03 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.03 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 4.60 | 283/1579 | 4.60 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.60 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 21 | 4.57 | 733/1518 | 4.57 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.57 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 26 | 4.80 | 802/1520 | 4.80 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 4.45 | 674/1517 | 4.45 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.45 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 4.57 | 568/1550 | 4.57 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.57 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 4.52 | 256/1295 | 4.52 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.52 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.22 | 651/1398 | 4.22 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.22 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 368/1391 | 4.78 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.78 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 21 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.56 | 609/1388 | 4.56 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.56 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 21 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 27 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | **** | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 28 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 215 | **** | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.28 | **** | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 28 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 198 | **** | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.21 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 23 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 3 | Major | 28 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 0 | General | 18 | Under-grad | 27 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 17 | 3.00-3.49 | 10 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 3 | 3.50-4.00 | 8 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 11 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 825
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.31 | 841/1639 | 3.97 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.31 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3.77 | 1350/1639 | 3.92 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.77 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4.08 | 942/1397 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.08 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 3.83 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3.75 | 1046/1532 | 3.92 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 3.75 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.33 | 544/1504 | 3.71 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 4.33 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4.15 | 924/1612 | 3.78 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.15 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4.92 | 529/1635 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.92 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.83 | 1109/1579 | 3.94 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.83 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.25 | 1094/1518 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.69 | 992/1520 | 4.45 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.69 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4.08 | 1036/1517 | 4.14 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.08 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 3.86 | 1188/1550 | 3.53 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.86 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3.67 | 894/1295 | 3.08 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.67 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 929/1398 | 3.80 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 1220/1391 | 3.50 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 3.50 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.75 | 175/ 224 | 3.92 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | 3.75 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.63 | 199/ 240 | 3.61 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 3.63 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 125/ 219 | 4.03 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 3.50 | 196/ 215 | 3.70 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 3.50 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 4.25 | 98/ 198 | 3.95 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 4.25 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.83 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.56 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.02 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.84 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.58 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.71 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.73 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 32 | **** | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.64 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | 5.00 | 4.52 | 4.50 | **** | |

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 825
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 3 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 12 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 12 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 826
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1326/1639 | 3.97 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1090/1639 | 3.92 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 795/1397 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 1261/1583 | 3.83 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.75 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 3.92 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.40 | 1259/1504 | 3.71 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.40 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1360/1612 | 3.78 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.60 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 3.94 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 947/1518 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.40 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 1377/1520 | 4.45 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.20 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 947/1517 | 4.14 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.20 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.20 | 1411/1550 | 3.53 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.20 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | 1247/1295 | 3.08 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 2.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1398 | 3.80 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1391 | 3.50 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1388 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 129/ 224 | 3.92 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 201/ 240 | 3.61 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 3.60 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | 200/ 219 | 4.03 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 3.80 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 192/ 215 | 3.70 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 3.80 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | 157/ 198 | 3.95 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 3.80 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 1 | Required for Majors 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 3 | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 1 | General 1 | Under-grad | 5 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | 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: ENME 482L 0102
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 827
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1326/1639 | 3.97 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1090/1639 | 3.92 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4.25 | 795/1397 | 4.19 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.25 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 1261/1583 | 3.83 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.75 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 774/1532 | 3.92 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 4.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3.40 | 1259/1504 | 3.71 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.40 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1360/1612 | 3.78 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.60 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 4.97 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 3.94 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1518 | 4.32 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.40 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1520 | 4.45 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.20 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1517 | 4.14 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.20 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1550 | 3.53 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 3.20 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1295 | 3.08 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 2.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/1398 | 3.80 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | **** | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1391 | 3.50 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | **** | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1388 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 129/ 224 | 3.92 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 201/ 240 | 3.61 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | 3.60 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | 200/ 219 | 4.03 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | 3.80 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.80 | 192/ 215 | 3.70 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.28 | 3.80 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.80 | 157/ 198 | 3.95 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.21 | 3.80 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 1 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 3 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 1 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 5 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | 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: ENME 489C 0101
 Title MACROMECHANICS/COMPOSI
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 828
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 3.67 | 1416/1639 | 3.67 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.67 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 3.63 | 1432/1639 | 3.63 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 3.63 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3.56 | 1256/1397 | 3.56 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 3.56 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3.64 | 1345/1583 | 3.64 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.64 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.25 | 1360/1532 | 3.25 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 3.25 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3.56 | 1183/1504 | 3.56 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 3.56 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3.36 | 1451/1612 | 3.36 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 3.36 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 4.13 | 1434/1635 | 4.13 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.13 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 3.50 | 1318/1579 | 3.50 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.50 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3.92 | 1301/1518 | 3.92 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 3.92 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 4.23 | 1363/1520 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.23 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 3.54 | 1335/1517 | 3.54 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.54 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.08 | 1043/1550 | 4.08 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.08 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1295 | **** | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | **** | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/1388 | **** | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 13 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 13 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 1 | General | 9 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 9 | 3.00-3.49 | 7 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 489E 0101
 Title ELECTROMAG ENERGY CNVR
 Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 829
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 615/1639 | 4.50 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 517/1639 | 4.50 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 973/1397 | 4.00 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 476/1583 | 4.50 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1532 | 5.00 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 5.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 5.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1612 | 5.00 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 5.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1635 | 5.00 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1579 | 5.00 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 5.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1518 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1520 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1517 | 5.00 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1550 | 5.00 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1295 | 5.00 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 5.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 958 | 5.00 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | 5.00 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 85 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.83 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 82 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 78 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.56 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 80 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.59 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 82 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.02 | 5.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101
 Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE
 Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 830
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 5 | 4.00 | 1138/1639 | 4.00 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 5 | 4.05 | 1059/1639 | 4.05 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.29 | 4.05 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.55 | 477/1397 | 4.55 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.38 | 4.55 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 4.00 | 1010/1583 | 4.00 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3.40 | 1300/1532 | 3.40 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.07 | 3.40 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 2.82 | 1444/1504 | 2.82 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.20 | 2.82 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 4.00 | 1044/1612 | 4.00 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.00 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 4.57 | 1087/1635 | 4.57 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.72 | 4.57 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 3.47 | 1336/1579 | 3.47 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.21 | 3.47 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 4.05 | 1223/1518 | 4.05 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.05 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 4.71 | 961/1520 | 4.71 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.75 | 4.71 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 3.95 | 1132/1517 | 3.95 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.95 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 4.05 | 1057/1550 | 4.05 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.05 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4.00 | 623/1295 | 4.00 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 625/1398 | 4.25 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.23 | 4.25 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 887/1391 | 4.17 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.48 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.50 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 16 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | ****/ 958 | **** | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.24 | **** | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.00 | 4.11 | 4.26 | **** | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 219 | **** | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.42 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 85 | **** | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.83 | **** | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.49 | **** | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.56 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.59 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.02 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 4.84 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.58 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.71 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.73 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.64 | **** | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 50 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.00 | **** | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 43 | **** | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.85 | **** | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 32 | **** | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.67 | **** | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | 5.00 | 4.52 | 4.50 | **** | |

Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101
 Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE
 Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 830
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 12 | Required for Majors | 1 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 18 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 8 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 0 | General | 16 | Under-grad | 22 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101
 Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 831
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 366/1639 | 4.71 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 323/1397 | 4.71 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.71 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.33 | 697/1583 | 4.33 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 553/1532 | 4.29 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.29 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 5.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 259/1612 | 4.71 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.71 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 1087/1635 | 4.57 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.57 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.00 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 286/1518 | 4.86 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.86 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 674/1520 | 4.86 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.86 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 198/1517 | 4.86 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.86 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 231/1550 | 3.62 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.62 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 265/1295 | 4.50 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 260/1398 | 4.75 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 393/1391 | 4.75 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.75 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.60 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 841/ 958 | 3.00 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 240 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.96 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 219 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 215 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 198 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.74 | 5.00 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 52/ 85 | 4.50 | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 47/ 82 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.74 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 53/ 78 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 44/ 80 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 33/ 82 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.37 | 4.50 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 45/ 52 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 4.04 | 3.64 | 2.00 | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 18/ 53 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 28/ 42 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.50 | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 22/ 37 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 17/ 32 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.59 | 4.50 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 29/ 50 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 43 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | 5.00 | 4.52 | 4.42 | **** | |

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101
 Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 831
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 4 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 3 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 4 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101
 Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 832
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 366/1639 | 4.71 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 323/1397 | 4.71 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.71 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.33 | 697/1583 | 4.33 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 553/1532 | 4.29 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.29 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 5.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 259/1612 | 4.71 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.71 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 1087/1635 | 4.57 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.57 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1440/1550 | 3.62 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.62 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 260/1398 | 4.75 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 393/1391 | 4.75 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.75 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.60 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 841/ 958 | 3.00 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 240 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.96 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 219 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 215 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 198 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.74 | 5.00 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 52/ 85 | 4.50 | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 47/ 82 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.74 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 53/ 78 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 44/ 80 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 33/ 82 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.37 | 4.50 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 45/ 52 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 4.04 | 3.64 | 2.00 | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 18/ 53 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 28/ 42 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.50 | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 22/ 37 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 17/ 32 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.59 | 4.50 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 29/ 50 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 43 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | 5.00 | 4.52 | 4.42 | **** | |

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101
 Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 832
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 4 | Major | 6 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 3 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 4 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101
 Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 833
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 366/1639 | 4.71 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.71 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1639 | 5.00 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 323/1397 | 4.71 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.71 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.33 | 697/1583 | 4.33 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 553/1532 | 4.29 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.29 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 5.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 259/1612 | 4.71 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.71 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.57 | 1087/1635 | 4.57 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.57 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 260/1398 | 4.75 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.75 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 393/1391 | 4.75 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.75 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 571/1388 | 4.60 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.60 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | 841/ 958 | 3.00 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.43 | **** | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 240 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.96 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 219 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 215 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 198 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.74 | 5.00 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 52/ 85 | 4.50 | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 47/ 82 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.74 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | 53/ 78 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 44/ 80 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 33/ 82 | 4.50 | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.37 | 4.50 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 45/ 52 | 2.00 | 2.75 | 4.04 | 3.64 | 2.00 | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 18/ 53 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 28/ 42 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 4.50 | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 22/ 37 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 17/ 32 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.59 | 4.50 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 29/ 50 | 4.50 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 43 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 21 | **** | 5.00 | 4.52 | 4.42 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

| | | | |
|---|---|-------|---|
| I | 0 | Other | 6 |
| ? | 0 | | |

Course-Section: ENME 662 0101
 Title LINEAR VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 834
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4.27 | 880/1639 | 4.27 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.27 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4.13 | 981/1639 | 4.13 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.13 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 574/1397 | 4.47 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.47 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.67 | 1324/1583 | 3.67 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3.36 | 1317/1532 | 3.36 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 3.36 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3.83 | 990/1504 | 3.83 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.83 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3.93 | 1135/1612 | 3.93 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.93 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 913/1635 | 4.73 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.73 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4.00 | 889/1579 | 4.00 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.00 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.40 | 947/1518 | 4.40 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.40 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 925/1520 | 4.73 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.73 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.14 | 990/1517 | 4.14 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.14 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.15 | 982/1550 | 4.15 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.15 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3.57 | 943/1295 | 3.57 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.57 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3.13 | 1252/1398 | 3.13 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.13 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3.25 | 1281/1391 | 3.25 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 3.25 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3.89 | 1043/1388 | 3.89 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 3.89 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.25 | 934/ 958 | 2.25 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 2.25 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 224 | **** | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.43 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 52 | **** | 2.75 | 4.04 | 3.64 | **** | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 53 | **** | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.03 | **** | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 42 | **** | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.78 | **** | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.33 | **** | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 32 | **** | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.59 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 2 | A | 6 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 6 | Major | 9 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 9 | Non-major | 6 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 10 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 670 0101
 Title CONTINUUM MECHANICS
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 835
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 4 | 4.10 | 1068/1639 | 4.10 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.10 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 684/1639 | 4.40 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.40 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.70 | 342/1397 | 4.70 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 4.70 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 640/1583 | 4.38 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 4.38 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 469/1532 | 4.38 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 4.38 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 441/1504 | 4.44 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 4.44 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 113/1612 | 4.90 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 4.90 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 4.33 | 1288/1635 | 4.33 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.33 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 569/1579 | 4.33 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 4.33 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 213/1518 | 4.90 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.90 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 802/1520 | 4.80 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 4.70 | 371/1517 | 4.70 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.70 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 638/1550 | 4.50 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.50 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 346/1295 | 4.40 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 4.40 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 4.14 | 708/1398 | 4.14 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 4.14 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 489/1391 | 4.67 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 4.67 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 647/1388 | 4.50 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.50 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 119/ 958 | 4.75 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 4.75 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 224 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.43 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 240 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.96 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 219 | 5.00 | 4.23 | 4.44 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 215 | 5.00 | 3.93 | 4.35 | 4.72 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 198 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.18 | 4.74 | 5.00 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 85 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.58 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 82 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.52 | 4.74 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 78 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.52 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 80 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 82 | 5.00 | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.37 | 5.00 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 52 | 5.00 | 2.75 | 4.04 | 3.64 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 53 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.05 | 4.03 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 42 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.75 | 4.78 | 5.00 | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 37 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.33 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.56 | 4.59 | 5.00 | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 50 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.39 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.50 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 43 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.69 | 4.61 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 32 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.31 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 21 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.52 | 4.42 | 5.00 | |

Course-Section: ENME 670 0101
 Title CONTINUUM MECHANICS
 Instructor: ASSAKKAF, IBRAH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 835
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 7 | Major | 7 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 1 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 3 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 7 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENME 812E 0101
 Title ELECTROMECHANIC ENERGY
 Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 836
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 814/1639 | 4.33 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 4.33 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 948/1639 | 4.17 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | 1318/1397 | 3.33 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 3.33 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3.67 | 1324/1583 | 3.67 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3.60 | 1184/1532 | 3.60 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 3.60 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3.75 | 1051/1504 | 3.75 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 3.75 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.50 | 1399/1612 | 3.50 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 3.50 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4.17 | 1415/1635 | 4.17 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.17 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1133/1579 | 3.80 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 3.80 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 807/1518 | 4.50 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 4.50 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 725/1520 | 4.83 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1083/1517 | 4.00 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 832/1550 | 4.33 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.33 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 806/1295 | 3.80 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.80 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1271/1398 | 3.00 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | 1265/1391 | 3.33 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 3.33 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 944/1388 | 4.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 4.00 | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.00 | 4.11 | 3.96 | **** | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 78 | **** | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.52 | **** | |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.70 | 4.47 | 4.50 | **** | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 82 | **** | 4.70 | 4.16 | 4.37 | **** | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 37 | **** | 4.63 | 4.58 | 4.33 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 813F 0101
 Title MICRO FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 837
 FEB 13, 2008
 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 1546/1639 | 3.33 | 3.89 | 4.27 | 4.42 | 3.33 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | 1536/1639 | 3.33 | 3.96 | 4.22 | 4.26 | 3.33 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | 1393/1397 | 2.67 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.37 | 2.67 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | 1324/1583 | 3.67 | 3.91 | 4.19 | 4.31 | 3.67 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1421/1532 | 3.00 | 3.61 | 4.01 | 4.10 | 3.00 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.67 | 1471/1504 | 2.67 | 3.93 | 4.05 | 4.29 | 2.67 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | 1571/1612 | 2.67 | 3.96 | 4.16 | 4.27 | 2.67 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 1001/1635 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.65 | 4.81 | 4.67 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.33 | 1565/1579 | 2.33 | 3.70 | 4.08 | 4.17 | 2.33 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1481/1518 | 3.00 | 4.23 | 4.43 | 4.49 | 3.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 1414/1520 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.70 | 4.79 | 4.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1453/1517 | 3.00 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 4.32 | 3.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1440/1550 | 3.00 | 3.73 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 1158/1295 | 3.00 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.00 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1398 | 5.00 | 3.81 | 4.07 | 4.22 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1391 | 5.00 | 3.90 | 4.30 | 4.47 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1388 | 5.00 | 4.01 | 4.28 | 4.49 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 841/ 958 | 3.00 | 3.42 | 3.93 | 4.01 | 3.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

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