

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C  
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 819  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.14	4.28	4.29	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	885/1648	4.27	4.06	4.23	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	8	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	254/1595	4.73	4.09	4.20	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	966/1533	3.86	3.60	4.04	4.04	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	808/1512	4.13	3.98	4.10	4.14	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	883/1623	4.20	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1268/1646	4.43	4.79	4.69	4.63	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	571/1621	4.36	3.89	4.06	4.01	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	1435/1572	4.14	4.57	4.70	4.73	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	620/1564	4.54	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	994/1559	4.21	3.95	4.29	4.33	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	650/1352	4.08	3.87	3.98	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.56	4.08	3.99	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.97	4.29	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.95	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.03	3.95	3.89	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 221	4.60	4.18	4.16	4.45	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	210/ 243	3.50	3.88	4.12	4.47	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	156/ 212	4.00	4.14	4.40	4.62	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	172/ 209	3.75	3.99	4.35	4.64	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	470/ 555	3.50	4.55	4.29	4.33	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.27	3.68	3.65	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	44/ 52	2.75	2.75	4.06	3.93	2.75	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	41/ 53	3.80	3.80	4.30	4.07	3.80	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101  
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C  
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 819  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 220 0101  
 Title MECHANICS OF MATERIALS  
 Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,  
 Enrollment: 77  
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 820  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	17	49	4.64	459/1649	4.64	4.14	4.28	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	22	43	4.53	533/1648	4.53	4.06	4.23	4.25	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	19	43	4.43	641/1375	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.37	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	1	0	3	17	24	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.09	4.20	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	12	20	30	4.20	673/1533	4.20	3.60	4.04	4.04	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	0	0	3	10	19	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.98	4.10	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	18	48	4.61	382/1623	4.61	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	69	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	18	41	4.55	339/1621	4.55	3.89	4.06	4.01	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	7	57	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	64	4.97	237/1572	4.97	4.57	4.70	4.73	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	11	23	29	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.01	4.28	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	11	15	37	4.32	911/1559	4.32	3.95	4.29	4.33	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	15	1	3	11	12	22	4.04	667/1352	4.04	3.87	3.98	4.07	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	778/1384	4.06	3.56	4.08	3.99	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	1	0	4	5	8	4.06	934/1382	4.06	3.97	4.29	4.19	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	832/1368	4.28	3.95	4.30	4.21	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	52	11	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	3.93	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	43
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	9	C	17	General	0	Under-grad	70	Non-major	27
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0						
						Other	54				

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101  
 Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER  
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 821  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	15	23	4.40	789/1649	4.40	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	15	15	3.98	1155/1648	3.98	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	10	12	20	4.24	823/1375	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.24		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	0	3	12	16	4.21	865/1595	4.21	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	1	11	7	15	4.06	781/1533	4.06	3.60	4.04	4.05	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	817/1512	4.13	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	6	17	16	4.05	1009/1623	4.05	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	18	17	4.41	511/1621	4.41	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	13	27	4.56	791/1568	4.56	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	414/1572	4.93	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	17	18	4.19	1010/1564	4.19	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	5	12	21	4.19	1009/1559	4.19	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	4	7	13	15	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.18	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.14	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	3.99	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	228/ 555	4.90	4.55	4.29	4.22	4.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	2	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	1	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ENME 301 0101  
 Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER  
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 821  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	12
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 301H 0101  
 Title STRUCT/PROP:ENGR MATER  
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 822  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	844/1649	4.36	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	780/1375	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	465/1533	4.42	3.60	4.04	4.05	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	627/1512	4.31	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	748/1646	4.86	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	428/1621	4.46	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	833/1564	4.36	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	804/1559	4.43	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1051/1384	3.57	3.56	4.08	4.11	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	899/1382	4.14	3.97	4.29	4.37	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	948/1368	4.00	3.95	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.03	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 288	4.75	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.75	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	12/ 110	4.67	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	
				P	0	
				I	0	
				?	1	
-----						
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0
			General	0	Under-grad	14
			Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			Other	11	Non-major	2

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT  
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 823  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	1429/1649	3.75	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1262/1648	3.49	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	665/1375	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	2	3.53	1389/1595	3.39	4.09	4.20	4.21	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	5	3	4	0	2.77	1492/1533	2.73	3.60	4.04	4.05	2.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	2	4	2	3.00	1428/1512	3.15	3.98	4.10	4.11	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1405/1623	3.23	3.88	4.16	4.08	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	7	0	3.43	1393/1621	3.21	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	6	4	3.79	1391/1568	4.01	4.36	4.43	4.39	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1241/1572	4.43	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	4	3	2	3.15	1480/1564	3.15	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	5	2	3.31	1432/1559	3.38	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1270/1352	2.52	3.87	3.98	3.97	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1366/1384	2.55	3.56	4.08	4.11	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1370/1382	2.66	3.97	4.29	4.37	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1339/1368	2.74	3.95	4.30	4.39	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	178/ 221	3.58	4.18	4.16	4.07	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	220/ 243	3.20	3.88	4.12	3.89	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	156/ 212	3.93	4.14	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	169/ 209	3.60	3.99	4.35	4.12	3.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	467/ 555	3.60	4.55	4.29	4.22	3.55	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	36/ 288	4.43	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.60	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 312	4.38	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.75	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.75	4.42	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 303 0102  
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT  
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 824  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	2	1	3.00	1591/1648	3.49	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	950/1375	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	3	1	3.18	1504/1595	3.39	4.09	4.20	4.21	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	4	2	1	0	2.57	1504/1533	2.73	3.60	4.04	4.05	2.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	3	0	2.91	1459/1512	3.15	3.98	4.10	4.11	2.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	1	2	2.75	1579/1623	3.23	3.88	4.16	4.08	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	4	4	0	3.09	1489/1621	3.21	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1279/1568	4.01	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1365/1572	4.43	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	6	1	1	2.91	1520/1564	3.15	4.01	4.28	4.25	2.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1389/1559	3.38	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	1347/1352	2.52	3.87	3.98	3.97	1.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1357/1384	2.55	3.56	4.08	4.11	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1372/1382	2.66	3.97	4.29	4.37	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1331/1368	2.74	3.95	4.30	4.39	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	200/ 221	3.58	4.18	4.16	4.07	3.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	239/ 243	3.20	3.88	4.12	3.89	2.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	183/ 212	3.93	4.14	4.40	4.21	3.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	206/ 209	3.60	3.99	4.35	4.12	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	477/ 555	3.60	4.55	4.29	4.22	3.43	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.43	4.27	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.38	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	11/ 110	4.75	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: ENME 303 0103  
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT  
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 825  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	1	6	3.85	1319/1649	3.75	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1441/1648	3.49	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	763/1375	4.24	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1416/1595	3.39	4.09	4.20	4.21	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	1	0	2	2.86	1483/1533	2.73	3.60	4.04	4.05	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	4	4	3.54	1246/1512	3.15	3.98	4.10	4.11	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	0	5	4	3.46	1405/1623	3.23	3.88	4.16	4.08	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	2	5	0	3.10	1488/1621	3.21	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1137/1568	4.01	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1273/1572	4.43	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1431/1564	3.15	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	2	5	3.38	1412/1559	3.38	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1219/1352	2.52	3.87	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1122/1384	2.55	3.56	4.08	4.11	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1233/1382	2.66	3.97	4.29	4.37	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1326/1368	2.74	3.95	4.30	4.39	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	184/ 221	3.58	4.18	4.16	4.07	3.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	155/ 243	3.20	3.88	4.12	3.89	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	156/ 212	3.93	4.14	4.40	4.21	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	151/ 209	3.60	3.99	4.35	4.12	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	442/ 555	3.60	4.55	4.29	4.22	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.43	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.38	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.75	4.42	3.99	4.05	****	

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 7	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 2
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 12

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101  
 Title MACHINE DESIGN  
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 826  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	5	4	3.65	1443/1649	3.65	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	5	3	3.47	1494/1648	3.47	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1176/1375	3.59	4.22	4.27	4.22	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	3	4	2	2	3.27	1487/1595	3.27	4.09	4.20	4.21	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1441/1533	3.00	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1387/1512	3.22	3.98	4.10	4.11	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	6	3	0	5	2.88	1562/1623	2.88	3.88	4.16	4.08	2.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	398/1646	4.94	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	7	4	1	3.38	1412/1621	3.38	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1362/1568	3.87	4.36	4.43	4.39	3.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1419/1572	4.20	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	7	3	3	3.47	1403/1564	3.47	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	6	3	3.60	1344/1559	3.60	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1352	****	3.87	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1341/1384	2.60	3.56	4.08	4.11	2.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.97	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1071/1368	3.80	3.95	4.30	4.39	3.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	39/ 312	4.36	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.36	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	17/ 110	4.50	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.50	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101  
 Title FLUID MECHANICS  
 Instructor: CARMI, SHLOMO  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 827  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	736/1649	4.11	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	8	4.13	1032/1648	3.98	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	529/1375	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1067/1595	3.92	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	4	8	3	3.61	1173/1533	3.45	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	553/1512	4.19	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	9	7	4.00	1029/1623	4.12	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	4.71	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	14	1	3.84	1114/1621	3.59	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	652/1568	4.16	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	1222/1572	4.23	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	12	2	3.59	1362/1564	3.60	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	4	11	4.00	1121/1559	3.71	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	6	5	1	3.46	1069/1352	3.59	3.87	3.98	3.97	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	1	0	1	0	1.67	1375/1384	1.67	3.56	4.08	4.11	1.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1251/1382	3.33	3.97	4.29	4.37	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1229/1368	3.33	3.95	4.30	4.39	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	53/ 312	4.22	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.22	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 110	4.60	4.42	3.99	4.05	****	

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	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
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	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 320 0201  
 Title FLUID MECHANICS  
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 828  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	8	5	3.78	1366/1649	4.11	4.14	4.28	4.27	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	1287/1648	3.98	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	10	5	4.06	932/1375	4.29	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	0	8	3	3.85	1236/1595	3.92	4.09	4.20	4.21	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	4	1	2	5	3.29	1354/1533	3.45	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	883/1512	4.19	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	838/1623	4.12	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1277/1646	4.71	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	1429/1621	3.59	3.89	4.06	4.02	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1426/1568	4.16	4.36	4.43	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	1480/1572	4.23	4.57	4.70	4.64	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	4	4	6	3.61	1356/1564	3.60	4.01	4.28	4.25	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	4	5	3.41	1404/1559	3.71	3.95	4.29	4.23	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	935/1352	3.59	3.87	3.98	3.97	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1384	1.67	3.56	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1382	3.33	3.97	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1368	3.33	3.95	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 312	4.22	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	14/ 110	4.60	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.60	

Course-Section: ENME 320 0201  
 Title FLUID MECHANICS  
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 828  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101  
 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES  
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 829  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	452/1648	4.59	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	334/1375	4.73	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	996/1595	4.11	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	935/1533	3.89	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1022/1512	3.90	3.98	4.10	4.11	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	251/1623	4.73	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	664/1646	4.91	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	0	9	10	4.40	511/1621	4.40	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	840/1572	4.81	4.57	4.70	4.64	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	689/1564	4.48	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	1045/1559	4.14	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	7	1	6	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.87	3.98	3.97	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.05	****	

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 11		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 332H 0101  
 Title SOLID MECH & MAT LAB H  
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 830  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	770/1648	4.36	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	641/1375	4.43	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1065/1533	3.75	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	171/1512	4.79	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	994/1623	4.07	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	632/1621	4.31	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	851/1559	4.38	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	432/1352	4.36	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	93/ 221	4.38	4.18	4.16	4.07	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	149/ 243	4.13	3.88	4.12	3.89	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.14	4.40	4.21	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	58/ 209	4.71	3.99	4.35	4.12	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	238/ 555	4.80	4.55	4.29	4.22	4.80	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.36	3.68	3.60	4.25	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101  
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB  
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 831  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	590/1649	4.28	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1070/1648	3.97	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	950/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1067/1595	4.17	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	815/1533	3.80	3.60	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	352/1512	4.40	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1299/1623	3.88	3.88	4.16	4.08	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	207/1621	4.47	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	803/1568	4.77	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	715/1564	4.47	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	1016/1559	4.21	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	482/1352	4.43	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	56/ 221	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.07	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	121/ 243	4.10	3.88	4.12	3.89	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	39/ 212	4.29	4.14	4.40	4.21	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	151/ 209	3.75	3.99	4.35	4.12	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	311/ 555	4.24	4.55	4.29	4.22	4.44	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	4.27	3.68	3.58	4.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.17	4.42	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102  
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB  
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 832  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	933/1649	4.28	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	1021/1648	3.97	4.06	4.23	4.18	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	6	6	4.07	925/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	697/1595	4.17	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1533	3.80	3.60	4.04	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	380/1512	4.40	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	780/1623	3.88	3.88	4.16	4.08	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	428/1621	4.47	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	196/1568	4.77	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	537/1564	4.47	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	749/1559	4.21	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	565/1352	4.43	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	129/ 221	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.07	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	65/ 243	4.10	3.88	4.12	3.89	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	105/ 212	4.29	4.14	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 209	3.75	3.99	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	272/ 555	4.24	4.55	4.29	4.22	4.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	4.25	4.27	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.17	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Other	13
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	14
				Major	13
				Non-major	1
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103  
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB  
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 833  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1183/1649	4.28	4.14	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1408/1648	3.97	4.06	4.23	4.18	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1259/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.22	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.09	4.20	4.21	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1180/1533	3.80	3.60	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	782/1512	4.40	3.98	4.10	4.11	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1318/1623	3.88	3.88	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.47	3.89	4.06	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	344/1568	4.77	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1564	4.47	4.01	4.28	4.25	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1121/1559	4.21	3.95	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1352	4.43	3.87	3.98	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	208/ 221	3.94	4.18	4.16	4.07	3.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	210/ 243	4.10	3.88	4.12	3.89	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	198/ 212	4.29	4.14	4.40	4.21	3.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	186/ 209	3.75	3.99	4.35	4.12	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	464/ 555	4.24	4.55	4.29	4.22	3.60	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	24/ 110	4.17	4.42	3.99	4.05	4.33	

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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101  
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS  
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 834  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	11	3	26	21	5	3.09	1594/1649	3.09	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	16	24	17	3.71	1375/1648	3.71	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	14	23	23	3.95	992/1375	3.95	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	12	5	13	12	7	2.94	1548/1595	2.94	4.09	4.20	4.36	2.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	5	5	7	20	17	3.72	1093/1533	3.72	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	20	7	14	9	5	2.49	1494/1512	2.49	3.98	4.10	4.26	2.49	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	17	19	11	13	3.15	1509/1623	3.15	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	1	63	4.95	332/1646	4.95	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	14	7	26	6	2	2.55	1583/1621	2.55	3.89	4.06	4.24	2.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	5	5	17	17	19	3.63	1433/1568	3.63	4.36	4.43	4.54	3.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	10	12	21	14	7	2.94	1563/1572	2.94	4.57	4.70	4.79	2.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	6	13	20	18	6	3.08	1491/1564	3.08	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	20	8	19	8	7	2.58	1524/1559	2.58	3.95	4.29	4.41	2.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	47	7	2	1	3	1	2.21	****/1352	****	3.87	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	59	0	4	0	3	0	2	2.56	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	1	5	0	2	3.11	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	59	0	1	2	4	0	2	3.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	59	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.18	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	4.14	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	3.99	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	205/ 555	4.92	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	0	12	4	4.12	37/ 110	4.12	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.12	

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101  
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS  
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL  
 Enrollment: 79  
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 834  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	35	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	64
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	12	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	4
84-150	38	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 409 0101  
 Title MECH: DEFORMABLE SOLID  
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 835  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	743/1648	4.38	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375	4.63	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1485/1623	3.25	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	714/1646	4.88	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	812/1621	4.14	3.89	4.06	4.24	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1220/1568	4.13	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1064/1564	4.13	4.01	4.28	4.40	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	695/1559	4.50	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	970/1352	3.67	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101  
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB  
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 836  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1295/1649	3.93	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	897/1648	3.88	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1281/1375	3.42	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	983/1595	4.04	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1533	2.47	3.60	4.04	4.14	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1403/1512	3.83	3.98	4.10	4.26	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	936/1623	3.60	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	4.97	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1192/1621	3.63	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1321/1572	3.96	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1344/1559	3.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	879/1352	3.40	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	3.80	3.88	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	3.25	4.14	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	3.80	3.99	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	252/ 555	4.35	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.75
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.42	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102  
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB  
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 837  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1351/1649	3.93	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	3.60	1448/1648	3.88	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1296/1375	3.42	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1275/1595	4.04	4.09	4.20	4.36	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1493/1533	2.47	3.60	4.04	4.14	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	755/1512	3.83	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	1	2	3.40	1434/1623	3.60	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.97	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	1415/1621	3.63	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1527/1572	3.96	4.57	4.70	4.79	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1297/1564	3.80	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1508/1559	3.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1266/1352	3.40	3.87	3.98	4.07	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.73	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	3.80	3.88	4.12	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 212	3.25	4.14	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	3.80	3.99	4.35	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	349/ 555	4.35	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.29
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	27/ 312	4.42	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.60
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	6	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 432L 0103  
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB  
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 838  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1106/1649	3.93	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1333/1648	3.88	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1087/1375	3.42	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	853/1595	4.04	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1522/1533	2.47	3.60	4.04	4.14	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	817/1512	3.83	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1485/1623	3.60	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	4.97	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1175/1621	3.63	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1502/1572	3.96	4.57	4.70	4.79	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1246/1564	3.80	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1400/1559	3.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1016/1352	3.40	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	118/ 221	4.20	4.18	4.16	4.73	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	183/ 243	3.80	3.88	4.12	4.61	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	208/ 212	3.25	4.14	4.40	4.57	3.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	169/ 209	3.80	3.99	4.35	4.63	3.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	388/ 555	4.35	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	21/ 312	4.42	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	7				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ENME 444 0101  
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI  
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 839  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1479/1649	3.85	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	672/1648	4.50	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.65	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	782/1595	4.44	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1533	4.45	3.60	4.04	4.14	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	799/1512	4.23	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	936/1623	4.04	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1462/1646	4.36	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	914/1621	4.25	3.89	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1169/1568	4.39	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1321/1572	4.66	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	780/1564	4.52	4.01	4.28	4.40	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1009/1559	4.14	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	4.55	3.87	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	4.83	3.56	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	4.83	3.97	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	4.90	3.95	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.03	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.27	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.25	4.36	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 110	4.50	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.50	

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 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 444 0102  
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI  
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 840  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1096/1649	3.85	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	487/1648	4.50	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.65	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	383/1595	4.44	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	311/1533	4.45	3.60	4.04	4.14	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	616/1512	4.23	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	4	8	3.94	1134/1623	4.04	3.88	4.16	4.27	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	1139/1646	4.36	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	374/1621	4.25	3.89	4.06	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	767/1568	4.39	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.66	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	498/1564	4.52	4.01	4.28	4.40	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	1088/1559	4.14	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	638/1352	4.55	3.87	3.98	4.07	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.83	3.56	4.08	4.35	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382	4.83	3.97	4.29	4.56	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.90	3.95	4.30	4.58	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	5.00	4.03	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	4.27	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.25	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	17/ 110	4.50	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 462 0101  
 Title INTR ENGR ACOUSTICS  
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 841  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	1076/1649	4.14	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	529/1375	4.52	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	5	5	5	3.61	1173/1533	3.61	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	711/1512	4.23	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	754/1621	4.20	3.89	4.06	4.24	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	8	8	4.10	1083/1564	4.10	4.01	4.28	4.40	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1075/1559	4.10	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.87	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 7
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 3
				P 0	Electives 0
				I 0	Other 10
				? 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101  
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB  
 Instructor: TASCH, URI  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 842  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	762/1649	4.33	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	556/1648	4.13	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	529/1375	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	428/1595	4.53	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1200/1533	3.29	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	366/1512	4.51	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	296/1623	4.47	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	1	9	5	4.00	914/1621	3.50	3.89	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	372/1568	4.74	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	967/1572	4.87	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	854/1564	3.92	4.01	4.28	4.40	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	2	8	3.93	1174/1559	4.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	792/1352	4.46	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	28/ 221	4.72	4.18	4.16	4.73	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	204/ 243	4.11	3.88	4.12	4.61	3.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	186/ 212	3.89	4.14	4.40	4.57	3.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	121/ 209	4.19	3.99	4.35	4.63	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	267/ 555	4.73	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.70	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	36/ 312	4.57	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.40	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 110	4.00	4.42	3.99	4.22	****	

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	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102  
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB  
 Instructor: TASCH, URI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 843  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	965/1649	4.33	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1347/1648	4.13	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.64	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	497/1595	4.53	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1441/1533	3.29	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	380/1512	4.51	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1623	4.47	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1504/1621	3.50	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.74	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.87	4.57	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1388/1564	3.92	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.30	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.46	3.87	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	45/ 221	4.72	4.18	4.16	4.73	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/ 243	4.11	3.88	4.12	4.61	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	156/ 212	3.89	4.14	4.40	4.57	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	151/ 209	4.19	3.99	4.35	4.63	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/ 555	4.73	4.55	4.29	4.41	4.75	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 312	4.57	4.36	3.68	3.95	4.75	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.42	3.99	4.22	4.00	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
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	2

Course-Section: ENME 489C 0101  
 Title MACROMECHANICS/COMPOSI  
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 844  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	4	9	4	3.60	1471/1649	3.60	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	8	2	3.24	1566/1648	3.24	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	5	9	2	3.30	1267/1375	3.30	4.22	4.27	4.48	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	7	3	3	3.12	1525/1595	3.12	4.09	4.20	4.36	3.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	6	1	3	5	2	2.76	1492/1533	2.76	3.60	4.04	4.14	2.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	3	5	2	1	2.44	1496/1512	2.44	3.98	4.10	4.26	2.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	5	7	1	2	2.58	1596/1623	2.58	3.88	4.16	4.27	2.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	748/1646	4.85	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	9	4	1	3.19	1468/1621	3.19	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	5	5	6	3.72	1411/1568	3.72	4.36	4.43	4.54	3.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	1449/1572	4.11	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	5	6	3	3	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	4	6	2	3.05	1473/1559	3.05	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1352	****	3.87	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	21	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489F 0101  
 Title COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DY  
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 845  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.14	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.06	4.23	4.36	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.09	4.20	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1249/1533	3.50	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	782/1512	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.26	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.89	4.06	4.24	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1028/1564	4.17	4.01	4.28	4.40	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1231/1559	3.83	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.18	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.14	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	3.99	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.66	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0
				P	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	4
				Electives	0
				Graduate	1
				Under-grad	7
				Major	6
				Non-major	2
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	2
?	2		



Course-Section: ENME 489L 0101  
 Title ELEMENTS OF AEROSPACE  
 Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 846  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	6	11	6	3.69	1408/1649	3.69	4.14	4.28	4.50	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	15	1	3.38	1532/1648	3.38	4.06	4.23	4.36	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	797/1375	4.27	4.22	4.27	4.48	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	13	4	3.73	1295/1595	3.73	4.09	4.20	4.36	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	5	7	6	3.31	1347/1533	3.31	3.60	4.04	4.14	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	10	4	2	2.69	1485/1512	2.69	3.98	4.10	4.26	2.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	9	11	4	0	2.65	1592/1623	2.65	3.88	4.16	4.27	2.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.79	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	5	7	8	0	2.87	1543/1621	2.87	3.89	4.06	4.24	2.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	12	8	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	7	16	4.46	1273/1572	4.46	4.57	4.70	4.79	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	3	11	7	3.73	1306/1564	3.73	4.01	4.28	4.40	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	4	9	6	3.42	1400/1559	3.42	3.95	4.29	4.41	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	15	4	3.80	879/1352	3.80	3.87	3.98	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.56	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	****	3.97	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	3.95	4.30	4.58	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	12
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 631 0101  
 Title ADV. COND. & RADIATION  
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 847  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.14	4.28	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	216/1648	4.80	4.06	4.23	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	116/1375	4.93	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1595	4.89	4.09	4.20	4.35	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	432/1533	4.44	3.60	4.04	4.28	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	294/1512	4.63	3.98	4.10	4.35	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	261/1623	4.71	3.88	4.16	4.29	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1103/1646	4.60	4.79	4.69	4.81	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	348/1621	4.53	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.36	4.43	4.52	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	498/1564	4.64	4.01	4.28	4.41	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	618/1559	4.57	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	234/1352	4.63	3.87	3.98	4.10	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1384	4.20	3.56	4.08	4.30	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.97	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.56	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	4.27	3.68	3.87	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	2.75	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.80	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	14/ 110	4.60	4.42	3.99	3.92	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12



Course-Section: ENME 645 0101  
 Title APPL COMP THERMO/FLUID  
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 848  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.14	4.28	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.06	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.09	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	624/1533	4.25	3.60	4.04	4.28	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1512	4.75	3.98	4.10	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.88	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.79	4.69	4.81	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.36	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.57	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.01	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	3.95	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	3.87	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.56	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	3.97	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.95	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.03	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	4.18	4.16	4.27	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	3.88	4.12	4.61	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 212	5.00	4.14	4.40	4.73	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 209	5.00	3.99	4.35	4.80	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.36	3.68	3.83	4.00	

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 2	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 2	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENME 664 0101  
 Title DYNAMICS  
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 849  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.14	4.28	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	729/1648	4.39	4.06	4.23	4.34	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	334/1375	4.72	4.22	4.27	4.44	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.09	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	624/1533	4.25	3.60	4.04	4.28	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	711/1512	4.23	3.98	4.10	4.35	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	768/1623	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.29	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	9	6	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.79	4.69	4.81	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	754/1621	4.20	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	779/1568	4.56	4.36	4.43	4.52	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.57	4.70	4.83	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	741/1564	4.44	4.01	4.28	4.41	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	390/1559	4.75	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	457/1352	4.33	3.87	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	937/1384	3.80	3.56	4.08	4.30	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	716/1382	4.40	3.97	4.29	4.52	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1368	4.60	3.95	4.30	4.56	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.03	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.55	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	34/ 288	4.63	4.27	3.68	3.87	4.63	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	36/ 312	4.40	4.36	3.68	3.83	4.40	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	2	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
-----					
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	2	8
			Other	8	12
					Major
					Non-major
					9
					**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 812T 0101  
 Title ADV KINEMATICS & MECH  
 Instructor: SU, HAIJUN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 850  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.14	4.28	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1313/1648	3.80	4.06	4.23	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1087/1375	3.80	4.22	4.27	4.44	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.09	4.20	4.35	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	733/1533	4.13	3.60	4.04	4.28	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	835/1512	4.10	3.98	4.10	4.35	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1241/1623	3.80	3.88	4.16	4.29	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.78	4.79	4.69	4.81	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	835/1621	4.13	3.89	4.06	4.20	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1358/1568	3.88	4.36	4.43	4.52	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1121/1572	4.63	4.57	4.70	4.83	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1297/1564	3.75	4.01	4.28	4.41	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	966/1559	4.25	3.95	4.29	4.41	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	836/1352	3.88	3.87	3.98	4.10	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1011/1384	3.67	3.56	4.08	4.30	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.97	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1229/1368	3.33	3.95	4.30	4.56	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	901/ 948	2.67	4.03	3.95	4.03	2.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	3.88	4.12	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	3.99	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.55	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.27	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.36	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.42	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 6	Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			