

Course-Section: ENME 110 0101
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 782
 JUL 2, 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	5	8	4.11	1081/1576	4.09	4.20	4.30	4.11	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	5	3.72	1322/1576	3.87	4.08	4.27	4.18	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	658/1342	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.19	4.44		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	6	4	2	3.36	1413/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.09	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	4	3	5	2	3.36	1310/1465	3.86	3.76	4.12	4.02	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1289/1434	4.03	4.01	4.14	3.94	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	1041/1547	4.01	4.08	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	1041/1574	4.66	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	7	3	3	3.38	1357/1554	3.56	3.89	4.10	4.01	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	8	4	4	3.50	1388/1488	3.83	4.37	4.47	4.41	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1493	4.78	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	5	7	1	3.11	1411/1486	3.18	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	6	0	2.89	1442/1489	3.28	3.96	4.32	4.22	2.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	1	8	4	3.65	953/1277	3.92	3.94	4.03	3.91	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	689/1279	3.78	3.78	4.17	3.96	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	3	5	4	6	3.72	1066/1270	3.39	3.75	4.35	4.09	3.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	928/1269	3.74	3.78	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	13	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	780/ 878	2.96	3.77	4.05	3.91	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.27	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 1	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 110 0102
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 783
 JUL 2, 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	5	5	6	3.94	1203/1576	4.09	4.20	4.30	4.11	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	5	3.71	1330/1576	3.87	4.08	4.27	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	931/1342	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.19	4.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1179/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.09	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1287/1465	3.86	3.76	4.12	4.02	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1117/1434	4.03	4.01	4.14	3.94	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	908/1547	4.01	4.08	4.19	4.10	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	508/1574	4.66	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1267/1554	3.56	3.89	4.10	4.01	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1282/1488	3.83	4.37	4.47	4.41	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	888/1493	4.78	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	3	7	1	3.06	1417/1486	3.18	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	6	4	3.41	1341/1489	3.28	3.96	4.32	4.22	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	668/1277	3.92	3.94	4.03	3.91	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	603/1279	3.78	3.78	4.17	3.96	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	676/1270	3.39	3.75	4.35	4.09	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	728/1269	3.74	3.78	4.35	4.09	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	688/ 878	2.96	3.77	4.05	3.91	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 110 0103
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 784
 JUL 2, 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	3	3	4.00	1148/1576	4.09	4.20	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1058/1576	3.87	4.08	4.27	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	925/1342	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1199/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.09	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	513/1465	3.86	3.76	4.12	4.02	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	777/1434	4.03	4.01	4.14	3.94	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1255/1547	4.01	4.08	4.19	4.10	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1227/1574	4.66	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1405/1554	3.56	3.89	4.10	4.01	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1380/1488	3.83	4.37	4.47	4.41	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.78	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1355/1486	3.18	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1375/1489	3.28	3.96	4.32	4.22	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	856/1277	3.92	3.94	4.03	3.91	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	802/1279	3.78	3.78	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.39	3.75	4.35	4.09	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	819/1269	3.74	3.78	4.35	4.09	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	839/ 878	2.96	3.77	4.05	3.91	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 8 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 110 0104
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 785
 JUL 2, 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	9	4.32	882/1576	4.09	4.20	4.30	4.11	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	7	4	3.68	1337/1576	3.87	4.08	4.27	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	9	4.21	865/1342	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.19	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1141/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.09	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	587/1465	3.86	3.76	4.12	4.02	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434	4.03	4.01	4.14	3.94	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	932/1547	4.01	4.08	4.19	4.10	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	795/1574	4.66	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	924/1554	3.56	3.89	4.10	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	1142/1488	3.83	4.37	4.47	4.41	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	607/1493	4.78	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	6	6	2	3.28	1384/1486	3.18	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	1266/1489	3.28	3.96	4.32	4.22	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	533/1277	3.92	3.94	4.03	3.91	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	7	2	4	3.18	1159/1279	3.78	3.78	4.17	3.96	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	3	5	2	4	3.06	1204/1270	3.39	3.75	4.35	4.09	3.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	0	5	5	4	3.41	1139/1269	3.74	3.78	4.35	4.09	3.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	12	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	847/ 878	2.96	3.77	4.05	3.91	2.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 15	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 110 0105
 Title STATICS
 Instructor: IRVINE, DAVID E
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 786
 JUL 2, 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	2	1	2	6	4.09	1094/1576	4.09	4.20	4.30	4.11	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1082/1576	3.87	4.08	4.27	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	972/1342	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1362/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1043/1465	3.86	3.76	4.12	4.02	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	797/1434	4.03	4.01	4.14	3.94	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1041/1547	4.01	4.08	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	813/1574	4.66	4.77	4.64	4.59	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1253/1554	3.56	3.89	4.10	4.01	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1316/1488	3.83	4.37	4.47	4.41	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	784/1493	4.78	4.66	4.73	4.65	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1421/1486	3.18	4.04	4.32	4.26	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	1	4	3.09	1409/1489	3.28	3.96	4.32	4.22	3.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	850/1277	3.92	3.94	4.03	3.91	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1157/1279	3.78	3.78	4.17	3.96	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	1	0	6	0	2.73	1239/1270	3.39	3.75	4.35	4.09	2.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	6	0	1	2.64	1245/1269	3.74	3.78	4.35	4.09	2.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	843/ 878	2.96	3.77	4.05	3.91	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 787
 JUL 2, 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	9	7	4.28	928/1576	4.28	4.20	4.30	4.35	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1023/1576	4.28	4.08	4.27	4.32	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	857/1342	4.34	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	614/1520	4.35	4.01	4.25	4.26	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	6	4	2	3.20	1347/1465	3.25	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	852/1434	4.04	4.01	4.14	4.06	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	1041/1547	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	1496/1574	4.06	4.77	4.64	4.62	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	924/1554	4.16	3.89	4.10	4.05	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.73	4.37	4.47	4.44	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	868/1493	4.65	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	545/1486	4.59	4.04	4.32	4.29	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1200/1489	4.16	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	5	4	7	3.78	876/1277	3.99	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	758/1279	4.17	3.78	4.17	4.14	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	6	2	5	3.44	1149/1270	3.59	3.75	4.35	4.30	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	3	4	6	3.69	1061/1269	3.56	3.78	4.35	4.29	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	2	0	5	2	3.78	620/ 878	4.04	3.77	4.05	3.92	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	4.63	4.43	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 240	3.88	4.27	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 229	4.86	4.38	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 232	3.88	4.23	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	4.13	4.32	4.20	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Major 16
				P 0	Non-major 2
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 17
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 788
 JUL 2, 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	4	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	373/1576	4.28	4.20	4.30	4.35	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	279/1576	4.28	4.08	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	369/1342	4.34	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	511/1520	4.35	4.01	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1138/1465	3.25	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	473/1434	4.04	4.01	4.14	4.06	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	527/1547	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	15	5	4.25	1324/1574	4.06	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	281/1554	4.16	3.89	4.10	4.05	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	401/1488	4.73	4.37	4.47	4.44	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	810/1493	4.65	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	484/1486	4.59	4.04	4.32	4.29	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	461/1489	4.16	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	366/1277	3.99	3.94	4.03	4.01	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	657/1279	4.17	3.78	4.17	4.14	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	887/1270	3.59	3.75	4.35	4.30	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	840/1269	3.56	3.78	4.35	4.29	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	339/ 878	4.04	3.77	4.05	3.92	4.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	57/ 234	4.63	4.43	4.23	4.44	4.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	210/ 240	3.88	4.27	4.35	4.47	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	44/ 229	4.86	4.38	4.51	4.65	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	181/ 232	3.88	4.23	4.29	4.38	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	200/ 379	4.13	4.32	4.20	4.29	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 788
 JUL 2, 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	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 204 0103
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 789
 JUL 2, 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	3	8	8	3.86	1274/1576	4.28	4.20	4.30	4.35	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	3	11	3.91	1237/1576	4.28	4.08	4.27	4.32	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	6	10	4.10	941/1342	4.34	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	998/1520	4.35	4.01	4.25	4.26	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	5	3	4	4	3	2.84	1422/1465	3.25	3.76	4.12	4.09	2.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	2	3	9	3	3.61	1167/1434	4.04	4.01	4.14	4.06	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	5	4	9	3.90	1145/1547	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.22	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	15	3	4.00	1459/1574	4.06	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	1103/1554	4.16	3.89	4.10	4.05	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	736/1488	4.73	4.37	4.47	4.44	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	1296/1493	4.65	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	654/1486	4.59	4.04	4.32	4.29	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	4	10	3.90	1192/1489	4.16	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	1	3	4	9	3.75	889/1277	3.99	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	751/1279	4.17	3.78	4.17	4.14	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	1	5	2	4	3.20	1187/1270	3.59	3.75	4.35	4.30	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	6	0	2	3	3	2.79	1236/1269	3.56	3.78	4.35	4.29	2.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 878	4.04	3.77	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 234	4.63	4.43	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 240	3.88	4.27	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 229	4.86	4.38	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 232	3.88	4.23	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 379	4.13	4.32	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: ENME 204 0103
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 789
 JUL 2, 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	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	6
84-150	5	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 217 0102
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 790
 JUL 2, 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	4	3	9	6	4	3.12	1526/1576	2.96	4.20	4.30	4.35	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	9	6	2	2.92	1540/1576	2.94	4.08	4.27	4.32	2.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	11	6	3	3.04	1291/1342	3.03	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	3	1	4	1	4	3.15	1456/1520	2.78	4.01	4.25	4.26	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	989/1465	3.59	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	2	3	4	5	3.50	1204/1434	3.47	4.01	4.14	4.06	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	8	7	5	3.35	1394/1547	3.41	4.08	4.19	4.22	3.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	665/1574	4.60	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	4	11	3	1	2.70	1511/1554	2.51	3.89	4.10	4.05	2.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	3	10	5	4	3.08	1448/1488	2.93	4.37	4.47	4.44	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	7	6	11	3.96	1423/1493	4.06	4.66	4.73	4.75	3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	5	7	4	3	2.72	1456/1486	2.44	4.04	4.32	4.29	2.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	6	5	4	2.85	1446/1489	2.70	3.96	4.32	4.31	2.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	6	4	3	5	2	2.65	1221/1277	2.56	3.94	4.03	4.01	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	5	4	5	5	3.09	1175/1279	3.41	3.78	4.17	4.14	3.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	5	4	5	5	3.18	1189/1270	3.96	3.75	4.35	4.30	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	5	5	6	4	3.33	1163/1269	3.42	3.78	4.35	4.29	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	709/ 878	3.21	3.77	4.05	3.92	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 217 0103
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 791
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	3	3	6	1	5	3.11	1526/1576	2.96	4.20	4.30	4.35	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	5	3	3	3.06	1519/1576	2.94	4.08	4.27	4.32	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	6	2	3.22	1275/1342	3.03	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	2	3	0	2	2.78	1496/1520	2.78	4.01	4.25	4.26	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	1012/1465	3.59	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1123/1434	3.47	4.01	4.14	4.06	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	3	8	3.72	1251/1547	3.41	4.08	4.19	4.22	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	911/1574	4.60	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	6	4	2	0	2.43	1531/1554	2.51	3.89	4.10	4.05	2.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	5	2	4	4	3.06	1449/1488	2.93	4.37	4.47	4.44	3.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	1296/1493	4.06	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	5	5	1	2	2.44	1474/1486	2.44	4.04	4.32	4.29	2.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	3	5	2	2	2.59	1462/1489	2.70	3.96	4.32	4.31	2.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	2	3	0	2	2.78	1205/1277	2.56	3.94	4.03	4.01	2.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	5	4	5	3.47	1076/1279	3.41	3.78	4.17	4.14	3.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	770/1270	3.96	3.75	4.35	4.30	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	7	0	7	3.59	1092/1269	3.42	3.78	4.35	4.29	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	791/ 878	3.21	3.77	4.05	3.92	3.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENME 217 0104
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 792
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1562/1576	2.96	4.20	4.30	4.35	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1549/1576	2.94	4.08	4.27	4.32	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	3	0	2.83	1318/1342	3.03	4.17	4.32	4.41	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1514/1520	2.78	4.01	4.25	4.26	2.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.59	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1325/1434	3.47	4.01	4.14	4.06	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1432/1547	3.41	4.08	4.19	4.22	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1262/1574	4.60	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1533/1554	2.51	3.89	4.10	4.05	2.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	0	3	0	2.67	1474/1488	2.93	4.37	4.47	4.44	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1447/1493	4.06	4.66	4.73	4.75	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1482/1486	2.44	4.04	4.32	4.29	2.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1460/1489	2.70	3.96	4.32	4.31	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1257/1277	2.56	3.94	4.03	4.01	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1000/1279	3.41	3.78	4.17	4.14	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	784/1270	3.96	3.75	4.35	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1163/1269	3.42	3.78	4.35	4.29	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.21	3.77	4.05	3.92	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 221 0101
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: SU, HAIJUN
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 793
 JUL 2, 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	3	0	1	2	6	6	9	3.83	1299/1576	4.22	4.20	4.30	4.35	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	7	8	5	3.50	1392/1576	3.76	4.08	4.27	4.32	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	5	9	1	5	3.00	1294/1342	3.31	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	14	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	1466/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.26	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	3	3	3	1	9	3.53	1235/1465	3.90	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	14	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	836/1434	4.19	4.01	4.14	4.06	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	6	9	6	3.71	1259/1547	3.93	4.08	4.19	4.22	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	758/1574	4.85	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	3	6	8	0	3.17	1415/1554	3.41	3.89	4.10	4.05	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	6	13	4.25	1111/1488	4.58	4.37	4.47	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	8	7	7	3.75	1454/1493	4.20	4.66	4.73	4.75	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	2	7	9	3	3.29	1382/1486	3.73	4.04	4.32	4.29	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	4	6	4	6	3.17	1398/1489	3.74	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	3	2	2	4	9	3.70	923/1277	3.96	3.94	4.03	4.01	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	4	2	5	2	2.48	1252/1279	3.08	3.78	4.17	4.14	2.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	9	4	3	3	1	2.15	1260/1270	3.05	3.75	4.35	4.30	2.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	4	7	0	3	2.50	1247/1269	3.23	3.78	4.35	4.29	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	19	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	4.31	3.77	4.05	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 0 Major 23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 27 Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENME 221 0102
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: SU, HAIJUN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 794
 JUL 2, 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	3	9	14	4.33	861/1576	4.22	4.20	4.30	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	10	7	3.78	1303/1576	3.76	4.08	4.27	4.32	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	5	5	6	7	3.26	1269/1342	3.31	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1232/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.26	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	738/1465	3.90	3.76	4.12	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	816/1434	4.19	4.01	4.14	4.06	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	5	13	4.00	1041/1547	3.93	4.08	4.19	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	645/1574	4.85	4.77	4.64	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	9	8	2	3.43	1340/1554	3.41	3.89	4.10	4.05	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	666/1488	4.58	4.37	4.47	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	1201/1493	4.20	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	13	7	3.89	1204/1486	3.73	4.04	4.32	4.29	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	5	12	3.89	1200/1489	3.74	3.96	4.32	4.31	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	593/1277	3.96	3.94	4.03	4.01	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	6	3	11	3.75	962/1279	3.08	3.78	4.17	4.14	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	4	8	1	9	3.46	1145/1270	3.05	3.75	4.35	4.30	3.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	1	3	7	7	3.55	1104/1269	3.23	3.78	4.35	4.29	3.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	17	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	350/ 878	4.31	3.77	4.05	3.92	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 11	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	25
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 221 0103
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: SU, HAIJUN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 795
 JUL 2, 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	6	6	4.50	637/1576	4.22	4.20	4.30	4.35	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	1138/1576	3.76	4.08	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	0	6	3.67	1166/1342	3.31	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	768/1520	3.71	4.01	4.25	4.26	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	850/1465	3.90	3.76	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	594/1434	4.19	4.01	4.14	4.06	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	985/1547	3.93	4.08	4.19	4.22	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.85	4.77	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1253/1554	3.41	3.89	4.10	4.05	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	355/1488	4.58	4.37	4.47	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1321/1493	4.20	4.66	4.73	4.75	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1101/1486	3.73	4.04	4.32	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1020/1489	3.74	3.96	4.32	4.31	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	692/1277	3.96	3.94	4.03	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1186/1279	3.08	3.78	4.17	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	3	0	3	4	3.55	1127/1270	3.05	3.75	4.35	4.30	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	1076/1269	3.23	3.78	4.35	4.29	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 878	4.31	3.77	4.05	3.92	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: ENME 221 0103
 Title DYNAMICS
 Instructor: SU, HAIJUN
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 795
 JUL 2, 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 796
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	0	1	1	3	8	5	3.83	1299/1576	3.83	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.30	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	2	9	3	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.08	4.27	4.28	4.28	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	931/1342	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.11	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	1346/1520	3.56	4.01	4.25	4.25	3.56	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	1	5	4	4	3.44	1277/1465	3.44	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.44	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1184/1434	3.56	4.01	4.14	4.15	3.56	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	3	5	6	3.76	1235/1547	3.76	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.76	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	987/1574	4.61	4.77	4.64	4.61	4.61	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	3	7	4	2	3.31	1372/1554	3.31	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.31	3.31
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1363/1488	3.71	4.37	4.47	4.47	3.71	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1340/1493	4.29	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.29	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	4	6	5	1	3.06	1417/1486	3.06	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.06	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1288/1489	3.65	3.96	4.32	4.34	3.65	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	1	1	2	10	4.06	668/1277	4.06	3.94	4.03	4.11	4.06	4.06
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	3	1	1	2	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	3.78	4.17	4.20	3.00	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	4	1	2	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	3.75	4.35	4.42	3.00	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	3	1	3	1	3.25	1180/1269	3.25	3.78	4.35	4.41	3.25	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.09	****	****
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.24	****	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.32	****	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.48	****	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.16	****	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.17	****	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.37	****	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 303 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ENGINEER MAT
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 796
 JUL 2, 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	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: MAJID, ABDUL
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 797
 JUL 2, 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	9	6	12	9	2	2.71	1559/1576	2.71	4.20	4.30	4.30	2.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	5	16	8	4	3.03	1521/1576	3.03	4.08	4.27	4.28	3.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	4	17	7	5	3.08	1289/1342	3.08	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	5	6	11	8	4	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.01	4.25	4.25	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	6	1	7	15	6	3.40	1292/1465	3.40	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	7	3	12	6	1	2.69	1406/1434	2.69	4.01	4.14	4.15	2.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	8	11	9	5	3.14	1440/1547	3.14	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	547/1574	4.86	4.77	4.64	4.61	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	7	7	17	5	0	2.56	1521/1554	2.56	3.89	4.10	4.09	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	5	10	11	8	3.50	1388/1488	3.50	4.37	4.47	4.47	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	5	1	15	11	4	3.22	1484/1493	3.22	4.66	4.73	4.70	3.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	6	7	13	7	2	2.77	1453/1486	2.77	4.04	4.32	4.32	2.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	9	7	8	8	3	2.69	1459/1489	2.69	3.96	4.32	4.34	2.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	26	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	****/1277	****	3.94	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	5	1	0	1	0	1.57	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	3	0	3	1	0	2.29	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	3	0	3	1	0	2.29	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	5	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 34
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 38 Non-major 4
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 7	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 31	
			? 3		

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101
 Title FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 798
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	1353/1576	3.73	4.20	4.30	4.30	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	5	3	3.40	1438/1576	3.40	4.08	4.27	4.28	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1225/1342	3.47	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1418/1520	3.33	4.01	4.25	4.25	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	2	3	1	1	2.25	1458/1465	2.25	3.76	4.12	4.09	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1356/1434	3.11	4.01	4.14	4.15	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	4	2	3.20	1422/1547	3.20	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.87	4.77	4.64	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1375/1554	3.30	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	4	3	3	3.14	1441/1488	3.14	4.37	4.47	4.47	3.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	6	2	2	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	1	5	3.21	1389/1489	3.21	3.96	4.32	4.34	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.94	4.03	4.11	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.41	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.32	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****

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	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101
 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 799
 JUL 2, 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	2	6	16	4.35	850/1576	4.35	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	194/1576	4.85	4.08	4.27	4.28	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	418/1342	4.65	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	10	9	4.17	937/1520	4.17	4.01	4.25	4.25	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	824/1465	4.05	3.76	4.12	4.09	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	457/1547	4.56	4.08	4.19	4.21	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	805/1554	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.37	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	1101/1493	4.63	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	749/1486	4.46	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	8	13	4.25	955/1489	4.25	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	497/1277	4.29	3.94	4.03	4.11	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101
 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES
 Instructor: MA, RONGHUI
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 799
 JUL 2, 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	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	24				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 800
 JUL 2, 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	3	8	4.46	697/1576	4.36	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	1094/1576	3.86	4.08	4.27	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	1093/1342	3.68	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	859/1520	4.01	4.01	4.25	4.25	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	989/1465	3.42	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	878/1434	3.85	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1134/1547	3.53	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1574	4.96	4.77	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	732/1554	3.94	3.89	4.10	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.66	4.37	4.47	4.47	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.94	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	749/1486	4.25	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	649/1489	4.35	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	692/1277	3.52	3.94	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	3.17	3.78	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	3.17	3.75	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	2.75	3.78	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	117/ 234	4.26	4.43	4.23	4.24	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	79/ 240	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.32	4.58	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	48/ 229	4.71	4.38	4.51	4.48	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	121/ 232	4.05	4.23	4.29	4.16	4.42	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	77/ 379	3.97	4.32	4.20	4.17	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 800
 JUL 2, 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 801
 JUL 2, 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	4	2	7	4.23	976/1576	4.36	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	5	1	3.38	1445/1576	3.86	4.08	4.27	4.28	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	3	4	2	3.31	1259/1342	3.68	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1281/1520	4.01	4.01	4.25	4.25	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	2	4	1	1	2.70	1437/1465	3.42	3.76	4.12	4.09	2.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	2	3.54	1194/1434	3.85	4.01	4.14	4.15	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	5	3	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.53	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	4.96	4.77	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1166/1554	3.94	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	834/1488	4.66	4.37	4.47	4.47	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.94	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	969/1489	4.35	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1143/1277	3.52	3.94	4.03	4.11	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1249/1279	3.17	3.78	4.17	4.20	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1249/1270	3.17	3.75	4.35	4.42	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1247/1269	2.75	3.78	4.35	4.41	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	183/ 234	4.26	4.43	4.23	4.24	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	154/ 240	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.32	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	93/ 229	4.71	4.38	4.51	4.48	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	7	0	3.56	203/ 232	4.05	4.23	4.29	4.16	3.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	365/ 379	3.97	4.32	4.20	4.17	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 802
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	818/1576	4.36	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1058/1576	3.86	4.08	4.27	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1080/1342	3.68	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1008/1520	4.01	4.01	4.25	4.25	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	7	2	3	3.67	1166/1465	3.42	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	878/1434	3.85	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1267/1547	3.53	4.08	4.19	4.21	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.96	4.77	4.64	4.61	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	0	4	5	3.83	1110/1554	3.94	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	834/1488	4.66	4.37	4.47	4.47	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	4.94	4.66	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	936/1486	4.25	4.04	4.32	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	934/1489	4.35	3.96	4.32	4.34	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1043/1277	3.52	3.94	4.03	4.11	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	926/1279	3.17	3.78	4.17	4.20	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1024/1270	3.17	3.75	4.35	4.42	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1210/1269	2.75	3.78	4.35	4.41	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	68/ 234	4.26	4.43	4.23	4.24	4.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	128/ 240	4.39	4.27	4.35	4.32	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	103/ 229	4.71	4.38	4.51	4.48	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	152/ 232	4.05	4.23	4.29	4.16	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	210/ 379	3.97	4.32	4.20	4.17	4.09	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 360 0101
 Title VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 803
 JUL 2, 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	5	8	11	4.16	1042/1576	4.16	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	15	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.08	4.27	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	430/1342	4.64	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	4	10	7	3.88	1185/1520	3.88	4.01	4.25	4.25	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	3.76	4.12	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	5	7	7	3.74	1105/1434	3.74	4.01	4.14	4.15	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.08	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	235/1574	4.96	4.77	4.64	4.61	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	6	10	5	3.74	1180/1554	3.74	3.89	4.10	4.09	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	12	10	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.37	4.47	4.47	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	1006/1493	4.71	4.66	4.73	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	7	10	4	3.63	1300/1486	3.63	4.04	4.32	4.32	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	3	5	11	3.92	1184/1489	3.92	3.96	4.32	4.34	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/1277	****	3.94	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: ENME 360 0101
 Title VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 803
 JUL 2, 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	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	3
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	6	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	22				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 804
 JUL 2, 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	6	7	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	462/1576	4.62	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	286/1342	4.77	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1185/1520	3.88	4.01	4.25	4.38	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	3.76	4.12	4.22	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	772/1554	4.20	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	708/1488	4.64	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	966/1493	4.73	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	944/1486	4.27	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	754/1489	4.45	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	463/1277	4.33	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
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
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 412 0101
 Title MECH DESIGN:MANUF/PROD
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 805
 JUL 2, 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	3	13	4.81	235/1576	4.81	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	827/1342	4.27	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	945/1520	4.17	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	718/1465	4.18	3.76	4.12	4.22	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	827/1547	4.27	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	597/1554	4.36	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	173/1488	4.93	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	1029/1493	4.69	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	437/1486	4.69	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	579/1489	4.60	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	293/1277	4.54	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	962/1279	3.75	3.78	4.17	4.31	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.75	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	928/1269	4.00	3.78	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.56	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 423 0101
 Title HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN
 Instructor: FISHER, JESSE
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 806
 JUL 2, 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	2	8	18	4.48	667/1576	4.48	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	279/1576	4.76	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	381/1342	4.69	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	4	1	3	11	3.95	919/1465	3.95	3.76	4.12	4.22	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	435/1434	4.48	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	434/1547	4.59	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	24	5	4.17	1379/1574	4.17	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	584/1554	4.37	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	652/1488	4.68	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	499/1486	4.64	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	309/1489	4.80	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	656/1277	4.09	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	575/1279	4.38	3.78	4.17	4.31	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	827/1270	4.25	3.75	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	3.78	4.35	4.55	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENME 423 0101
 Title HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN
 Instructor: FISHER, JESSE
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 806
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	17	Under-grad	29	Non-major	2
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 807
 JUL 2, 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	2	8	4.80	243/1576	4.56	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1576	4.78	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1342	4.76	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	311/1520	4.68	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	850/1465	4.10	3.76	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434	4.34	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	690/1547	4.50	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	4.88	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	395/1554	4.33	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	624/1488	4.77	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.54	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	813/1489	4.34	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	829/1277	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	3.78	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	3.75	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	644/1269	4.50	3.78	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.77	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 234	4.85	4.43	4.23	4.28	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	4.93	4.27	4.35	4.45	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	67/ 229	4.85	4.38	4.51	4.70	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	57/ 232	4.92	4.23	4.29	4.56	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	155/ 379	4.64	4.32	4.20	4.19	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	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

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 808
 JUL 2, 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	2	2	4.20	1019/1576	4.56	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.78	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	4.76	4.17	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	395/1520	4.68	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	4.10	3.76	4.12	4.22	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1063/1434	4.34	4.01	4.14	4.30	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	411/1547	4.50	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.88	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	924/1554	4.33	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.77	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.54	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	888/1489	4.34	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	943/1277	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	4.50	3.78	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	4.75	3.75	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1269	4.50	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	5.00	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 234	4.85	4.43	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 240	4.93	4.27	4.35	4.45	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 229	4.85	4.38	4.51	4.70	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 232	4.92	4.23	4.29	4.56	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	55/ 379	4.64	4.32	4.20	4.19	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0103
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 809
 JUL 2, 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	8	4.67	415/1576	4.56	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576	4.78	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	4.76	4.17	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	249/1520	4.68	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	708/1465	4.10	3.76	4.12	4.22	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	511/1434	4.34	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.88	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.33	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1488	4.77	4.37	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	966/1493	4.84	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	261/1486	4.54	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	941/1489	4.34	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	506/1277	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	4.50	3.78	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	4.75	3.75	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	4.50	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	5.00	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 234	4.85	4.43	4.23	4.28	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 240	4.93	4.27	4.35	4.45	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.85	4.38	4.51	4.70	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 232	4.92	4.23	4.29	4.56	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 379	4.64	4.32	4.20	4.19	5.00	

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 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 12
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
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 810
 JUL 2, 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	7	7	4.17	1042/1576	4.23	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1023/1576	4.12	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	418/1520	4.46	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1465	4.17	3.76	4.12	4.22	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	878/1434	4.19	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	270/1547	4.59	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1056/1574	4.73	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	772/1554	4.05	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.74	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	810/1493	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	561/1486	4.63	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1027/1489	4.12	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	780/1277	4.10	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1022/1279	4.05	3.78	4.17	4.31	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	736/1270	4.45	3.75	4.35	4.53	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1269	4.50	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 444 0102
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: MILLER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 811
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	916/1576	4.23	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	1094/1576	4.12	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	768/1520	4.46	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	738/1465	4.17	3.76	4.12	4.22	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	544/1434	4.19	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	0	10	4.46	592/1547	4.59	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.73	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1060/1554	4.05	3.89	4.10	4.24	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.74	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.82	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	468/1486	4.63	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	0	7	4.08	1075/1489	4.12	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	515/1277	4.10	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.05	3.78	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.45	3.75	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	3.78	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 812
 JUL 2, 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	787/1576	4.28	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	476/1576	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	369/1342	4.32	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	614/1520	4.41	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	3.25	3.76	4.12	4.22	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	193/1434	4.47	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	527/1547	4.19	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	4.98	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1554	4.16	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	4.67	4.37	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1486	4.39	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	813/1489	3.82	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	258/1277	3.95	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	61/ 234	4.59	4.43	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	223/ 240	4.14	4.27	4.35	4.45	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	190/ 229	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.70	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	151/ 232	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.56	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	77/ 379	4.78	4.32	4.20	4.19	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0103
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 813
 JUL 2, 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	7	6	4.20	1019/1576	4.28	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1049/1576	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	827/1342	4.32	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	826/1520	4.41	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1337/1465	3.25	3.76	4.12	4.22	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	594/1434	4.47	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	690/1547	4.19	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.98	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1032/1554	4.16	3.89	4.10	4.24	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	1048/1488	4.67	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	1125/1493	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1047/1486	4.39	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1262/1489	3.82	3.96	4.32	4.38	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	791/1277	3.95	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 234	4.59	4.43	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	132/ 240	4.14	4.27	4.35	4.45	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	172/ 229	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.70	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	132/ 232	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.56	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	34/ 379	4.78	4.32	4.20	4.19	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0103
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 813
 JUL 2, 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	6	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 482L 0104
 Title: CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: TASCH, URI
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 814
 JUL 2, 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	952/1576	4.28	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	939/1576	4.33	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	972/1342	4.32	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.41	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	594/1434	4.47	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1276/1547	4.19	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	4.98	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1554	4.16	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1053/1493	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.39	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1363/1489	3.82	3.96	4.32	4.38	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1086/1277	3.95	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	74/ 234	4.59	4.43	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.14	4.27	4.35	4.45	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	133/ 229	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.70	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	103/ 232	4.34	4.23	4.29	4.56	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 379	4.78	4.32	4.20	4.19	5.00	

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

Course-Section: ENME 489B 0101
 Title BIOMECHANICS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 815
 JUL 2, 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	10	17	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	15	4.41	759/1576	4.41	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	22	4.70	357/1342	4.70	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	291/1520	4.72	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	16	4.42	483/1465	4.42	3.76	4.12	4.22	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	201/1434	4.74	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	10	10	4.11	963/1547	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.89	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	1018/1488	4.37	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	445/1493	4.93	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	366/1486	4.73	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	297/1489	4.81	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	2	6	3	10	3.86	823/1277	3.86	3.94	4.03	4.04	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 2 Major 26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 0	General	18 Under-grad 25 Non-major 1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 9	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	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 489J 0101
 Title INTRO/MATERIAL PROC/ME
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 816
 JUL 2, 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	15	4.70	373/1576	4.70	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	531/1342	4.55	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	902/1520	4.21	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	2	4	7	3.76	1095/1465	3.76	3.76	4.12	4.22	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	670/1434	4.26	4.01	4.14	4.30	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	586/1574	4.84	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	597/1554	4.36	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	324/1488	4.85	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	461/1489	4.70	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	222/1277	4.65	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.78	4.17	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	8
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 489N 0101
 Title MECH/BEHAVIOR/MATERIAL
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 817
 JUL 2, 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	0	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.20	4.30	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1380/1434	3.00	4.01	4.14	4.30	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.89	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.37	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.04	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.94	4.03	4.04	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.77	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 489R 0101
 Title ELECTRIC ENERGY CONV
 Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 818
 JUL 2, 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	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.20	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.01	4.25	4.38	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	3.89	4.10	4.24	3.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.37	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.04	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	3.96	4.32	4.38	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.94	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: ENME 489S 0101
 Title SPACE TECH & DESIGN
 Instructor: MOGAVERO, MARC
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 819
 JUL 2, 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	4	4	8	3.94	1203/1576	3.94	4.20	4.30	4.46	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	6	4.11	1067/1576	4.11	4.08	4.27	4.35	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	658/1342	4.44	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	8	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.01	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	6	5	3.61	1201/1465	3.61	3.76	4.12	4.22	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	5	4	3.33	1289/1434	3.33	4.01	4.14	4.30	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	871/1547	4.22	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	720/1574	4.78	4.77	4.64	4.69	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	805/1554	4.17	3.89	4.10	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.37	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	966/1493	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	1025/1486	4.17	4.04	4.32	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	12	4	4.11	1057/1489	4.11	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	533/1277	4.25	3.94	4.03	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	938/1279	3.80	3.78	4.17	4.31	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1270	****	3.75	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1269	****	3.78	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENME 605 0101
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 820
 JUL 2, 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.20	4.30	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.08	4.27	4.32	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.01	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	571/1465	4.33	3.76	4.12	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.01	4.14	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.43	3.89	4.10	4.18	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.37	4.47	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	696/1489	4.50	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	987/1277	3.57	3.94	4.03	4.08	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	3.78	4.17	4.34	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	3.75	4.35	4.53	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	3.78	4.35	4.55	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 640 0101
 Title FUND FLUID MECH I
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 821
 JUL 2, 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	5	5	2	3.62	1405/1576	3.62	4.20	4.30	4.43	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	2	3.67	1345/1576	3.67	4.08	4.27	4.32	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	850/1342	4.23	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.23		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1433/1520	3.27	4.01	4.25	4.36	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	2	5	1	3.17	1355/1465	3.17	3.76	4.12	4.25	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1172/1434	3.60	4.01	4.14	4.35	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.77	4.64	4.75	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1074/1554	3.89	3.89	4.10	4.18	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	834/1488	4.54	4.37	4.47	4.52	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1032/1486	4.15	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1251/1489	3.77	3.96	4.32	4.38	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	8	2	1	3.17	1128/1277	3.17	3.94	4.03	4.08	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	3	0	2.70	1234/1279	2.70	3.78	4.17	4.34	2.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	3.75	4.35	4.53	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1029/1269	3.78	3.78	4.35	4.55	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.11	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.40	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 11
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 677 0101
 Title APPLIED ELASTICITY
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 822
 JUL 2, 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	1	0	1	1	10	10	4	3.58	1420/1576	3.58	4.20	4.30	4.43	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	10	10	2	3.27	1482/1576	3.27	4.08	4.27	4.32	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	10	8	3.92	1048/1342	3.92	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1281/1520	3.70	4.01	4.25	4.36	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	3	9	6	1	3.15	1358/1465	3.15	3.76	4.12	4.25	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	1	1	9	3	1	3.13	1349/1434	3.13	4.01	4.14	4.35	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	6	7	10	3.96	1082/1547	3.96	4.08	4.19	4.24	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	665/1574	4.81	4.77	4.64	4.75	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	1	5	7	6	0	2.95	1470/1554	2.95	3.89	4.10	4.18	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	7	6	6	3.57	1381/1488	3.57	4.37	4.47	4.52	3.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	9	8	3	3.28	1383/1486	3.28	4.04	4.32	4.37	3.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	14	3	3.68	1278/1489	3.68	3.96	4.32	4.38	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	16	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1232/1277	2.57	3.94	4.03	4.08	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	1238/1279	2.63	3.78	4.17	4.34	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1147/1270	3.44	3.75	4.35	4.53	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1029/1269	3.78	3.78	4.35	4.55	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	18	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.11	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.10	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	4.50	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	5.00	4.03	4.10	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.33	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****

Course-Section: ENME 677 0101
 Title APPLIED ELASTICITY
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 822
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	11	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 678 0101
 Title FRACTURE MECHANICS
 Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 823
 JUL 2, 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	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.20	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.08	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.01	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.76	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.01	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.08	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.89	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.37	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.04	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.96	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	3.94	4.03	4.08	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.78	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	3.75	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	3.77	4.05	4.11	4.50	

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 1		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 1
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 811M 0101
 Title MECHATRONIC SYST DESIG
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 824
 JUL 2, 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	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.20	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.08	4.27	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.01	4.25	4.36	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	3.76	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.77	4.64	4.75	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	3.89	4.10	4.18	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.37	4.47	4.52	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	463/1277	4.33	3.94	4.03	4.08	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	3.78	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1156/1270	3.40	3.75	4.35	4.53	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1067/1269	3.67	3.78	4.35	4.55	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.27	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.38	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.23	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 52	4.00	4.50	4.48	4.40	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 1
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 812R 0101
 Title ELECTRIC ENERGY CONV
 Instructor: WAIKAR, SHAILES
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 825
 JUL 2, 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	2	0	3.67	1383/1576	3.67	4.20	4.30	4.43	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1345/1576	3.67	4.08	4.27	4.32	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1166/1342	3.67	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.01	4.25	4.36	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	3.76	4.12	4.25	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1380/1434	3.00	4.01	4.14	4.35	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	3.89	4.10	4.18	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.37	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	888/1489	4.33	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.94	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	3.78	4.17	4.34	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1208/1270	3.00	3.75	4.35	4.53	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1244/1269	2.67	3.78	4.35	4.55	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	225/ 234	3.00	4.43	4.23	4.36	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	238/ 240	2.50	4.27	4.35	4.37	2.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	229/ 229	1.00	4.38	4.51	4.51	1.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	229/ 232	2.00	4.23	4.29	4.47	2.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	378/ 379	2.50	4.32	4.20	4.37	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 815J 0101
 Title INTRO/MATERIAL PROC/ME
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 826
 JUL 2, 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	4	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.20	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.08	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.01	4.25	4.36	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	708/1465	4.20	3.76	4.12	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.01	4.14	4.35	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.77	4.64	4.75	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	3.89	4.10	4.18	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.37	4.47	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277	4.67	3.94	4.03	4.08	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.78	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.75	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.77	4.05	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 815N 0101
 Title MECH/BEHAVIOR/MATERIAL
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 827
 JUL 2, 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	2	5	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.20	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1058/1576	4.13	4.08	4.27	4.32	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	925/1342	4.13	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	719/1520	4.38	4.01	4.25	4.36	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	366/1465	4.50	3.76	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.01	4.14	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.08	4.19	4.24	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.77	4.64	4.75	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	3.89	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1181/1488	4.14	4.37	4.47	4.52	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.66	4.73	4.80	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.04	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	934/1489	4.29	3.96	4.32	4.38	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1277	4.60	3.94	4.03	4.08	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	3.78	4.17	4.34	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.67	3.75	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	3.77	4.05	4.11	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.43	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.50	4.27	4.35	4.37	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.38	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.23	4.29	4.47	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	4.32	4.20	4.37	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.50	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.65	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	5.00	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.50	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.80	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.33	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.75	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Course-Section: ENME 815N 0101
 Title MECH/BEHAVIOR/MATERIAL
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 827
 JUL 2, 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 815P 0101
 Title PLASTICITY
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 828
 JUL 2, 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	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.20	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.08	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.01	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	3.76	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.01	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.08	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.89	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.37	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.66	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.04	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.96	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.94	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	3.78	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	3.75	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	3.78	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.77	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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