

Course-Section: ENME 204 0101
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: GHARIB, AWAD A
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 717
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	262/1504	4.73	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	972/1503	4.31	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	731/1290	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	310/1453	4.49	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	6	2	3	2	3	2.63	1383/1421	2.60	3.60	4.00	3.90	2.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	922/1365	3.90	4.03	4.08	4.00	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	3	3	6	3.69	1214/1485	4.02	4.01	4.16	4.15	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	1235/1504	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	804/1483	4.18	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	420/1425	4.68	4.44	4.41	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	354/1418	4.46	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	564/1416	4.63	4.12	4.26	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	105/1199	4.55	3.97	3.97	3.95	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	255/1312	4.48	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	563/1303	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	841/1299	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	169/ 758	4.56	4.01	4.01	3.89	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	4.22	****

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	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: GHARIB, AWAD A
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 718
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	306/1504	4.73	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	495/1503	4.31	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	817/1290	4.26	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	656/1453	4.49	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	2	3	2	2	2.57	1386/1421	2.60	3.60	4.00	3.90	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	878/1365	3.90	4.03	4.08	4.00	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	648/1485	4.02	4.01	4.16	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	743/1504	4.58	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	602/1483	4.18	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	649/1425	4.68	4.44	4.41	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	643/1426	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	867/1418	4.46	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	407/1416	4.63	4.12	4.26	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	455/1199	4.55	3.97	3.97	3.95	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	572/1312	4.48	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1020/1303	4.17	4.32	4.24	4.23	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1299	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	4.56	4.01	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	35	****	4.50	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENME 204 0102
 Title INTRO ENGR DESIGN W/ C
 Instructor: GHARIB, AWAD A
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 718
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 217 0101
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: Nikolopoulos, A
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 719
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	1000/1504	4.60	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	618/1503	4.65	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	2	1	7	9	4.21	817/1290	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1209/1453	4.04	4.17	4.21	4.20	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	4	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1056/1421	3.77	3.60	4.00	3.90	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	11	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1003/1365	4.24	4.03	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	2	3	0	6	8	3.79	1158/1485	4.21	4.01	4.16	4.15	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	679/1483	4.47	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	366/1425	4.93	4.44	4.41	4.40	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	643/1426	4.74	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	887/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	994/1416	4.25	4.12	4.26	4.24	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/1199	****	3.97	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	565/1312	4.38	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	881/1303	3.95	4.32	4.24	4.23	4.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	1038/1299	3.86	4.20	4.25	4.21	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	16	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	3.89	****

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 217 0102
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: VONKERCZEK, CHR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 720
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.60	4.28	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	171/1503	4.65	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1290	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1453	4.04	4.17	4.21	4.20	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	669/1421	3.77	3.60	4.00	3.90	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	105/1365	4.24	4.03	4.08	4.00	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	591/1485	4.21	4.01	4.16	4.15	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.47	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.44	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	967/1426	4.74	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	772/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	806/1416	4.25	4.12	4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.97	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	465/1312	4.38	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	887/1303	3.95	4.32	4.24	4.23	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1047/1299	3.86	4.20	4.25	4.21	3.78

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	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 217 0103
 Title ENGR THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: Nikolopoulos, A
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 721
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	13	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	386/1504	4.60	4.28	4.27	4.26	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	248/1503	4.65	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	574/1290	4.49	4.23	4.28	4.27	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	3	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	631/1453	4.04	4.17	4.21	4.20	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.77	3.60	4.00	3.90	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	4	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	690/1365	4.24	4.03	4.08	4.00	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	523/1485	4.21	4.01	4.16	4.15	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	242/1483	4.47	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.44	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	926/1426	4.74	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	450/1418	4.38	4.10	4.25	4.22	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	829/1416	4.25	4.12	4.26	4.24	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1199	****	3.97	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	414/1312	4.38	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1086/1303	3.95	4.32	4.24	4.23	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	922/1299	3.86	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	4.52	****

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 304 0101
 Title MACHINE DESIGN
 Instructor: FARQUHAR, TONY
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 722
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	669/1504	4.42	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	0	0	4	9	13	4.35	736/1503	4.35	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	440/1290	4.58	4.23	4.28	4.31	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	4	1	0	6	7	8	3.95	1052/1453	3.95	4.17	4.21	4.23	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	5	1	5	5	4	5	3.35	1198/1421	3.35	3.60	4.00	4.01	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	9	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.03	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	2	6	10	7	3.88	1098/1485	3.88	4.01	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	5	15	2	3.86	1030/1483	3.86	4.06	4.06	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	4	12	8	4.08	1136/1425	4.08	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	6	18	1	3.80	1141/1418	3.80	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	15	7	4.16	945/1416	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	15	2	2	0	4	2	3.20	1018/1199	3.20	3.97	3.97	4.02	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1312	****	3.96	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	14
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	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	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 320 0101
 Title FLUID MECHANICS
 Instructor: BENNETT, DAWN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 723
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1469/1503	2.70	4.23	4.20	4.22	2.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.23	4.28	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	2	4	0	2.90	1425/1453	2.90	4.17	4.21	4.23	2.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	967/1421	3.75	3.60	4.00	4.01	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1211/1365	3.38	4.03	4.08	4.08	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	0	3	1	2.78	1424/1485	2.78	4.01	4.16	4.17	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	1058/1504	4.56	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	2.00	4.06	4.06	4.08	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1398/1425	2.80	4.44	4.41	4.43	2.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1390/1426	3.40	4.65	4.69	4.71	3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	1	3	0	2.50	1393/1418	2.50	4.10	4.25	4.26	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	2	2	0	2.40	1388/1416	2.40	4.12	4.26	4.27	2.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	****	3.97	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	4	0	0	1	2.33	1272/1312	2.33	3.96	4.00	4.09	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1257/1303	2.33	4.32	4.24	4.27	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1258/1299	2.33	4.20	4.25	4.30	2.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.74	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 321 0101
 Title TRANSFER PROCESSES
 Instructor: ZHU, LIANG
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 724
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	16	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	594/1504	4.48	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	16	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	440/1290	4.57	4.23	4.28	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	16	2	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	643/1453	4.37	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	7	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	429/1421	4.38	3.60	4.00	4.01	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	17	4	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	654/1365	4.19	4.03	4.08	4.08	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	536/1485	4.45	4.01	4.16	4.17	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	821/1483	4.05	4.06	4.06	4.08	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	402/1425	4.76	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	738/1426	4.81	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	3	2	10	6	3.90	1098/1418	3.90	4.10	4.25	4.26	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	1162/1416	3.76	4.12	4.26	4.27	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	7	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	607/1199	4.08	3.97	3.97	4.02	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1312	****	3.96	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	33	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	18
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	8	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 725
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	442/1504	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	312/1503	4.60	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.23	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1453	4.74	4.17	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1175/1421	3.41	3.60	4.00	4.01	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	105/1365	4.73	4.03	4.08	4.08	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	577/1485	4.27	4.01	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	115/1483	4.72	4.06	4.06	4.08	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	420/1425	4.74	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	578/1418	4.56	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1416	4.75	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	177/1199	4.75	3.97	3.97	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.96	4.00	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	26/ 233	4.80	4.68	4.09	4.12	4.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	34/ 244	4.72	4.08	4.09	4.20	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	44/ 227	4.86	4.51	4.40	4.46	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	125/ 225	4.49	4.54	4.23	4.29	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	79/ 207	4.36	4.48	4.09	4.14	4.33

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0101
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 726
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	442/1504	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	312/1503	4.60	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.23	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1453	4.74	4.17	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1175/1421	3.41	3.60	4.00	4.01	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	105/1365	4.73	4.03	4.08	4.08	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	577/1485	4.27	4.01	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	4.72	4.06	4.06	4.08	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1425	4.74	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1426	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1418	4.56	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1416	4.75	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1199	4.75	3.97	3.97	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.96	4.00	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	26/ 233	4.80	4.68	4.09	4.12	4.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	34/ 244	4.72	4.08	4.09	4.20	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	44/ 227	4.86	4.51	4.40	4.46	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	125/ 225	4.49	4.54	4.23	4.29	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	79/ 207	4.36	4.48	4.09	4.14	4.33

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0102
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 727
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1503	4.60	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	440/1453	4.74	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	3.41	3.60	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1365	4.73	4.03	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	990/1485	4.27	4.01	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.72	4.06	4.06	4.08	4.33

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.74	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.56	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1199	4.75	3.97	3.97	4.02	5.00

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	4.80	4.68	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	4.72	4.08	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	4.86	4.51	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	4.49	4.54	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	4.36	4.48	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 332L 0103
 Title SOLID MECH AND MAT LAB
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 728
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	788/1504	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	751/1503	4.60	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.23	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	532/1453	4.74	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1353/1421	3.41	3.60	4.00	4.01	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	581/1365	4.73	4.03	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	761/1485	4.27	4.01	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	173/1483	4.72	4.06	4.06	4.08	4.71

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	492/1425	4.74	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	895/1426	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	682/1418	4.56	4.10	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	554/1416	4.75	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	230/1199	4.75	3.97	3.97	4.02	4.57

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1312	3.67	3.96	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1303	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1299	4.00	4.20	4.25	4.30	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	56/ 233	4.80	4.68	4.09	4.12	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	64/ 244	4.72	4.08	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 227	4.86	4.51	4.40	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	51/ 225	4.49	4.54	4.23	4.29	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	69/ 207	4.36	4.48	4.09	4.14	4.40

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 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENME 360 0101
 Title VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: VONKERCEK, CHR
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 729
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	20	0	0	6	8	8	3	3.32	1405/1504	3.32	4.28	4.27	4.27	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	1	4	8	7	5	3.44	1331/1503	3.44	4.23	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	20	0	2	6	5	6	6	3.32	1196/1290	3.32	4.23	4.28	4.31	3.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	1	2	5	7	8	2	3.13	1390/1453	3.13	4.17	4.21	4.23	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	20	11	2	4	3	3	2	2.93	1330/1421	2.93	3.60	4.00	4.01	2.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	20	2	3	5	9	3	3	2.91	1314/1365	2.91	4.03	4.08	4.08	2.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	20	0	1	2	5	7	10	3.92	1066/1485	3.92	4.01	4.16	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	0	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	2	8	9	2	1	2.64	1436/1483	2.64	4.06	4.06	4.08	2.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	2	5	11	6	3.88	1229/1425	3.88	4.44	4.41	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	1	6	7	10	4.08	1311/1426	4.08	4.65	4.69	4.71	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	4	6	10	2	2	2.67	1379/1418	2.67	4.10	4.25	4.26	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	8	4	7	2	3	2.50	1378/1416	2.50	4.12	4.26	4.27	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	12	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	****/1199	****	3.97	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1312	****	3.96	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	42	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	4.14	****

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	25
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	11	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	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 403 0101
 Title AUTOMATIC CONTROLS
 Instructor: WARDAK, KHALED
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 730
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1189/1421	3.38	3.60	4.00	4.02	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.01	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1212/1426	4.38	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.12	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1199	****	3.97	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1312	****	3.96	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 731
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1504	4.93	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	335/1503	4.64	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	618/1453	4.38	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	623/1421	4.17	3.60	4.00	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	878/1365	3.93	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.01	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	105/1483	4.85	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	270/1425	4.85	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	165/1418	4.85	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	209/1416	4.85	4.12	4.26	4.26	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	369/1199	4.40	3.97	3.97	4.05	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1312	****	3.96	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 233	4.75	4.68	4.09	3.78	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	4.08	4.09	3.56	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.16	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 225	4.75	4.54	4.23	3.81	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 207	4.75	4.48	4.09	3.69	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.50	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 731
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 423 0101
 Title HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN
 Instructor: Sontag, Adam
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 732
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1503	4.86	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	758/1290	4.29	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1228/1421	3.29	3.60	4.00	4.02	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	935/1365	3.86	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	563/1485	4.43	4.01	4.16	4.14	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	940/1504	4.71	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.12	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	860/1199	3.67	3.97	3.97	4.05	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	632/1312	4.20	3.96	4.00	4.07	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.01	4.01	4.17	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	4.50	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 423 0101
 Title HEAT, VENT, AC DESIGN
 Instructor: Sontag, Adam
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 732
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 733
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1010/1504	3.82	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1052/1503	3.83	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	901/1453	3.72	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1256/1421	3.20	3.60	4.00	4.02	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1032/1365	3.72	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	990/1485	3.40	4.01	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.33	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.21	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1013/1418	3.75	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1225/1416	3.33	4.12	4.26	4.26	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	840/1199	3.99	3.97	3.97	4.05	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.96	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	88/ 233	4.10	4.68	4.09	3.78	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	178/ 244	3.50	4.08	4.09	3.56	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	102/ 227	4.40	4.51	4.40	4.16	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	92/ 225	4.70	4.54	4.23	3.81	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	93/ 207	4.00	4.48	4.09	3.69	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.50	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0101
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 733
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 432L 0102
 Title FLUIDS/ENERGY LAB
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 734
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1353/1504	3.82	4.28	4.27	4.33	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1247/1503	3.83	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1290	4.67	4.23	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1355/1453	3.72	4.17	4.21	4.22	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1421	3.20	3.60	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	1025/1365	3.72	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	4	2	0	2.80	1419/1485	3.40	4.01	4.16	4.14	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	5	5	0	3.17	1352/1483	3.33	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	1165/1425	4.21	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1250/1418	3.75	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	0	5	2	3.08	1319/1416	3.33	4.12	4.26	4.26	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	479/1199	3.99	3.97	3.97	4.05	4.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	171/ 233	4.10	4.68	4.09	3.78	3.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	220/ 244	3.50	4.08	4.09	3.56	3.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	171/ 227	4.40	4.51	4.40	4.16	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	51/ 225	4.70	4.54	4.23	3.81	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	144/ 207	4.00	4.48	4.09	3.69	3.80

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		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	12

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENME 444 0101
 Title MECH ENGR SYSTEMS DESI
 Instructor: WOOD, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 735
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1409/1504	3.31	4.28	4.27	4.33	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	1	4	2	2	4	3.31	1372/1503	3.31	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1290	****	4.23	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	1	0	4	4	1	3	3.25	1366/1453	3.25	4.17	4.21	4.22	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	6	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	****/1421	****	3.60	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	4	2	3	1	2.75	1329/1365	2.75	4.03	4.08	4.09	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	1	3	3	3	0	2	2.55	1450/1485	2.55	4.01	4.16	4.14	2.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	812/1504	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	3	3	1	2	3.22	1334/1483	3.22	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1272/1425	3.69	4.44	4.41	4.38	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1036/1426	4.62	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	3	1	6	3.69	1189/1418	3.69	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	2	3	1	0	6	3.42	1266/1416	3.42	4.12	4.26	4.26	3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	987/1199	3.33	3.97	3.97	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1312	****	3.96	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	15
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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 471 0101
 Title COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI
 Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 736
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1244/1504	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.33	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1052/1503	4.10	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1175/1290	3.90	4.23	4.28	4.32	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1168/1453	4.30	4.17	4.21	4.22	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1374/1421	3.06	3.60	4.00	4.02	2.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	645/1365	3.80	4.03	4.08	4.09	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	2	4	3.70	1206/1485	4.15	4.01	4.16	4.14	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1173/1504	4.70	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	700/1483	4.27	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1227/1425	4.32	4.44	4.41	4.38	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1237/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1232/1416	3.90	4.12	4.26	4.26	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.38	3.97	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	902/1312	3.13	3.96	4.00	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	922/1299	4.50	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	535/ 758	3.67	4.01	4.01	4.17	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	71/ 233	4.75	4.68	4.09	3.78	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	132/ 244	4.38	4.08	4.09	3.56	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	211/ 227	3.88	4.51	4.40	4.16	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	153/ 225	4.38	4.54	4.23	3.81	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 207	4.75	4.48	4.09	3.69	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	4.50	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 471 0101
 Title COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI
 Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 736
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 471 0102
 Title COMP AIDED FIN EL DESI
 Instructor: CHARALAMBIDES,
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 737
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept		UMBC		Level		Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	416/1504	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	910/1503	4.10	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	642/1290	3.90	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.30	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1175/1421	3.06	3.60	4.00	4.02	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1201/1365	3.80	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	349/1485	4.15	4.01	4.16	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	4.70	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.27	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.32	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1418	4.03	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	3.90	4.12	4.26	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	820/1199	3.38	3.97	3.97	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1247/1312	3.13	3.96	4.00	4.07	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	4.63	4.32	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	4.50	4.20	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	3.67	4.01	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 233	4.75	4.68	4.09	3.78	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	83/ 244	4.38	4.08	4.09	3.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	125/ 227	3.88	4.51	4.40	4.16	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	63/ 225	4.38	4.54	4.23	3.81	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 207	4.75	4.48	4.09	3.69	4.75

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

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 738
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	3	2	3.13	1436/1504	3.17	4.28	4.27	4.33	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	3	3.07	1411/1503	3.03	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	0	2	3	3	3.27	1207/1290	3.30	4.23	4.28	4.32	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1253/1453	3.69	4.17	4.21	4.22	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1189/1421	3.27	3.60	4.00	4.02	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1218/1365	3.46	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	4	3.60	1246/1485	3.70	4.01	4.16	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	916/1504	4.62	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	3	3	3	0	2.80	1415/1483	2.96	4.06	4.06	4.11	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1278/1425	3.58	4.44	4.41	4.38	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	1351/1426	3.87	4.65	4.69	4.72	3.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	6	1	5	3.40	1282/1418	3.13	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	1	3	2.80	1350/1416	2.61	4.12	4.26	4.26	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	946/1199	2.92	3.97	3.97	4.05	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1312	2.75	3.96	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1303	4.00	4.32	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	3.25	4.20	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	4.50	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0101
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 738
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 482L 0102
 Title CONTROLS/VIB LAB
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 739
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1426/1504	3.17	4.28	4.27	4.33	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1419/1503	3.03	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1193/1290	3.30	4.23	4.28	4.32	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1181/1453	3.69	4.17	4.21	4.22	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	4	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1269/1421	3.27	3.60	4.00	4.02	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1128/1365	3.46	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1146/1485	3.70	4.01	4.16	4.14	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1087/1504	4.62	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1364/1483	2.96	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1308/1425	3.58	4.44	4.41	4.38	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1349/1426	3.87	4.65	4.69	4.72	3.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1357/1418	3.13	4.10	4.25	4.25	2.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	2	0	1	2.43	1386/1416	2.61	4.12	4.26	4.26	2.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1153/1199	2.92	3.97	3.97	4.05	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1209/1312	2.75	3.96	4.00	4.07	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1166/1299	3.25	4.20	4.25	4.38	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	3.69	****

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489B 0101
 Title BIOMECHANICS
 Instructor: TOPOLESKI, LEON
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 740
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	482/1504	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	280/1290	4.72	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.60	4.00	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	370/1365	4.44	4.03	4.08	4.09	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	738/1485	4.28	4.01	4.16	4.14	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	567/1483	4.31	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1205/1425	3.94	4.44	4.41	4.38	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	964/1418	4.13	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	675/1416	4.47	4.12	4.26	4.26	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	412/1199	4.36	3.97	3.97	4.05	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	3.96	4.00	4.07	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 489J 0101
 Title MATERIALS AND PROC MEM
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 741
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	522/1504	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	1027/1503	4.05	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	2	2	13	4	3.90	1022/1290	3.90	4.23	4.28	4.32	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	6	5	0	7	1	1	2.50	1391/1421	2.50	3.60	4.00	4.02	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	3	4	8	4	3.68	1052/1365	3.68	4.03	4.08	4.09	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	591/1485	4.40	4.01	4.16	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	394/1504	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	587/1425	4.65	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.65	4.69	4.72	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	939/1418	4.16	4.10	4.25	4.25	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	485/1416	4.63	4.12	4.26	4.26	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	1	3	2	1	12	4.05	618/1199	4.05	3.97	3.97	4.05	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1312	****	3.96	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	25	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	35	****	4.50	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: ENME 489J 0101
 Title MATERIALS AND PROC MEM
 Instructor: ZUPAN, MARC
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 741
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	27	Non-major	9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 489N 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN MECH EN
 Instructor: KHAN, AKHTAR
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 742
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	455/1504	4.57	4.28	4.27	4.33	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1503	4.86	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	440/1290	4.57	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.17	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	3.60	4.00	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.03	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.01	4.16	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.83	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.43	4.44	4.41	4.38	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1119/1418	3.86	4.10	4.25	4.25	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	554/1416	4.57	4.12	4.26	4.26	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	561/1199	4.17	3.97	3.97	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.96	4.00	4.07	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.32	4.24	4.34	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	535/ 758	3.67	4.01	4.01	4.17	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 605 0101
 Title SYSTEMS ANALYSIS I
 Instructor: ANJANAPPA, MUNI
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 743
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	671/1290	4.38	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	524/1421	4.29	3.60	4.00	4.27	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.03	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	914/1485	4.13	4.01	4.16	4.24	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.65	4.69	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	818/1418	4.29	4.10	4.25	4.36	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.12	4.26	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.97	3.97	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.32	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.01	4.01	4.24	4.50

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	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENME 611 0101
 Title ADV MANUFACTUR PROCESS
 Instructor: AROLA, DWAYNE D
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 744
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	200/1503	4.78	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	250/1290	4.75	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	179/1453	4.78	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	3.60	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.03	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.01	4.16	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	139/1418	4.89	4.10	4.25	4.36	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.89	4.12	4.26	4.38	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.97	3.97	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	4.25	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.32	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.68	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	4.08	4.09	4.09	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.54	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.48	4.09	4.40	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 640 0101
 Title FUND FLUID MECH I
 Instructor: EGGLETON, CHARL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 745
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	311/1290	4.70	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1056/1421	3.60	3.60	4.00	4.27	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	645/1365	4.20	4.03	4.08	4.35	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1485	4.90	4.01	4.16	4.24	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	926/1426	4.70	4.65	4.69	4.80	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	709/1418	4.40	4.10	4.25	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.12	4.26	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	876/1199	3.63	3.97	3.97	4.04	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	902/1312	3.75	3.96	4.00	4.31	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1303	****	4.32	4.24	4.58	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1053/1299	3.75	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 645 0101
 Title APPL COMP THERMO/FLUID
 Instructor: Ronghui, Ma
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 746
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.83	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	140/1453	4.83	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1421	4.60	3.60	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	105/1365	4.83	4.03	4.08	4.35	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.01	4.16	4.24	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.10	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.12	4.26	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	542/1199	4.20	3.97	3.97	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	255/1312	4.67	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.32	4.24	4.58	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.01	4.01	4.24	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.68	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	145/ 244	4.00	4.08	4.09	4.09	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	179/ 227	4.00	4.51	4.40	4.66	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	103/ 225	4.50	4.54	4.23	4.69	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	61/ 207	4.50	4.48	4.09	4.40	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.46	4.50
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.75	5.00

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: ENME 645 0101
 Title APPL COMP THERMO/FLUID
 Instructor: Ronghui, Ma
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 746
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENME 677 0101
 Title APPLIED ELASTICITY
 Instructor: Karim, Mohammad
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 747
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	1	3	3	3.08	1443/1504	3.08	4.28	4.27	4.44	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	1365/1503	3.33	4.23	4.20	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1251/1290	2.91	4.23	4.28	4.36	2.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	1442/1453	2.56	4.17	4.21	4.34	2.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	1348/1421	2.86	3.60	4.00	4.27	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1262/1365	3.20	4.03	4.08	4.35	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.01	4.16	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	0	3	3	1	2.73	1428/1483	2.73	4.06	4.06	4.20	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1278/1425	3.67	4.44	4.41	4.51	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	1268/1426	4.25	4.65	4.69	4.80	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	3	5	1	3.08	1325/1418	3.08	4.10	4.25	4.36	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	2	3	3.25	1295/1416	3.25	4.12	4.26	4.38	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.97	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	2	2	0	2.43	1258/1312	2.43	3.96	4.00	4.31	2.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1103/1303	3.57	4.32	4.24	4.58	3.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1096/1299	3.57	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.66	****

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 4
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENME 812P 0101
 Title ANALOG AND DIGITAL ELE
 Instructor: GORTI, B.
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 748
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1030/1290	3.89	4.23	4.28	4.36	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	631/1453	4.38	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	571/1421	4.22	3.60	4.00	4.27	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.03	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.01	4.16	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1014/1504	4.63	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	139/1418	4.89	4.10	4.25	4.36	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.12	4.26	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	329/1199	4.44	3.97	3.97	4.04	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.20	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	535/ 758	3.67	4.01	4.01	4.24	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.68	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.08	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.51	4.40	4.66	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.48	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	2.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.00	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	1.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.53	4.37	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 812V 0101
 Title ADV TPCS IN VIBRATIONS
 Instructor: ZHU, WEIDONG
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 749
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.28	4.27	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	179/1453	4.78	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	145/1421	4.78	3.60	4.00	4.27	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	129/1365	4.78	4.03	4.08	4.35	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.01	4.16	4.24	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	724/1425	4.56	4.44	4.41	4.51	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.65	4.69	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	514/1418	4.56	4.10	4.25	4.36	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.89	4.12	4.26	4.38	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1199	4.83	3.97	3.97	4.04	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.32	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.20	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.01	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENME 815F 0101
 Title FINITE ELEMENT METHOD
 Instructor: Khoei, Amir
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 750
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.23	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.17	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.60	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.03	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1452/1485	2.50	4.01	4.16	4.24	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.44	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.10	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.12	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1138/1199	2.50	3.97	3.97	4.04	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1121/1303	3.50	4.32	4.24	4.58	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	239/ 244	1.00	4.08	4.09	4.09	1.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	67/ 70	2.00	2.00	4.35	4.21	2.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 67	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	76/ 76	1.00	1.00	4.44	4.39	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant