

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: GRINER, ANITA E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 851
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	803/1649	4.38	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	839/1648	4.31	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1119/1533	3.69	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	359/1512	4.54	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	926/1623	4.15	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1621	4.20	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1568	4.62	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1572	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1559	4.46	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1352	4.42	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	351/1384	4.64	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	585/1382	4.55	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	370/ 948	4.18	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.18	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	355/ 555	4.25	4.01	4.29	4.66	4.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	270/ 312	2.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	2.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	8	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: PETER, JAMES (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 852
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	803/1649	4.38	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	839/1648	4.31	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1119/1533	3.69	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	359/1512	4.54	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	926/1623	4.15	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1212/1572	4.54	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	749/1559	4.46	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	389/1352	4.42	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	351/1384	4.64	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	585/1382	4.55	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	370/ 948	4.18	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.18	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	355/ 555	4.25	4.01	4.29	4.66	4.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	270/ 312	2.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	2.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENMG 652 8050
 Title MGMT, LEADERSHIP AND CO
 Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 853
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	265/1649	4.77	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	168/1648	4.77	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	258/1375	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	236/1595	4.71	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	119/1533	4.67	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	77/1512	4.77	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	164/1623	4.71	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	234/1621	4.71	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	372/1568	4.87	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	253/1564	4.81	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	238/1559	4.87	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	370/1352	4.39	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	105/1384	4.90	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1382	4.97	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.90	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	122/ 948	4.78	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 555	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.60	3.81	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENMG 652 8051
 Title MGMT, LEADERSHIP AND CO
 Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 854
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	350/1649	4.77	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	362/1648	4.77	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	840/1375	4.50	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	321/1595	4.71	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	410/1533	4.67	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	310/1512	4.77	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	395/1623	4.71	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	165/1621	4.71	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	171/1568	4.87	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	4.97	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	263/1564	4.81	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	250/1559	4.87	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	457/1352	4.39	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	170/1384	4.90	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	170/1382	4.97	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	306/1368	4.90	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	104/ 948	4.78	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.91	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	323/ 555	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.66	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	215/ 312	3.60	3.81	3.68	3.83	3.60	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ENMG 652 8051
 Title MGMT, LEADERSHIP AND CO
 Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 854
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 656 8010
 Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS
 Instructor: OLIVER, MICHAEL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 855
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1070/1648	4.09	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	763/1375	4.30	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	217/1533	4.70	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	4.22	4.16	4.29	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1105/1621	3.79	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.71	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	511/1564	4.47	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	306/1559	4.76	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	7	2	4.00	690/1352	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	412/1384	4.55	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	666/1382	4.45	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.91	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	4.43	4.12	4.61	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.95	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	4.01	4.29	4.66	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.38	4.47	4.50	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	51/ 81	4.33	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	38/ 52	3.67	4.18	4.06	4.51	3.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.58	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	22/ 39	4.33	4.62	4.38	4.44	4.33	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	3.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	42/ 53	3.67	3.67	4.30	4.37	3.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	3.92	4.00	

Course-Section: ENMG 656 8010
 Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS
 Instructor: OLIVER, MICHAEL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 855
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 656 8010
 Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 856
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1070/1648	4.09	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	763/1375	4.30	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	217/1533	4.70	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	4.22	4.16	4.29	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1225/1621	3.79	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	588/1568	4.71	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	887/1564	4.47	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	475/1559	4.76	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	633/1352	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	412/1384	4.55	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	666/1382	4.45	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.91	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	4.43	4.12	4.61	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.95	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	490/ 555	3.00	4.01	4.29	4.66	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.38	4.47	4.50	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	51/ 81	4.33	4.67	4.43	4.43	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.13	4.35	4.42	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.36	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	38/ 52	3.67	4.18	4.06	4.51	3.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.40	4.47	4.58	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	22/ 39	4.33	4.62	4.38	4.44	4.33	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	193/ 312	3.75	3.81	3.68	3.83	3.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	42/ 53	3.67	3.67	4.30	4.37	3.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.00	3.99	3.92	4.00	

Course-Section: ENMG 656 8010
 Title ENGR LAW AND ETHICS
 Instructor: WILSON, RICHARD (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 856
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 662 8010
 Title FIN DECISION-MAKING EN
 Instructor: FENTON, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 857
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	844/1649	4.36	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	943/1648	4.21	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	347/1375	4.71	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	622/1595	4.42	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	10	2	3.92	895/1533	3.92	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	764/1512	4.18	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.93	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	7	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1198/1568	4.15	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	908/1564	4.29	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	994/1559	4.21	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	0	6	4	3.77	907/1352	3.77	3.91	3.98	4.10	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	771/1384	4.08	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1092/1382	3.77	4.49	4.29	4.52	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	896/1368	4.15	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.91	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.95	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	3.36	3.68	3.87	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.81	3.68	3.83	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.92	****	

Course-Section: ENMG 662 8010
 Title FIN DECISION-MAKING EN
 Instructor: FENTON, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 857
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 7 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 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other 11	

Course-Section: ENMG 672 8010
 Title DECISION & RISK ANALYS
 Instructor: MACCARTHY, JOHN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 858
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	853/1595	4.22	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	935/1533	3.89	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1498/1646	4.11	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1145/1568	4.22	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	894/1572	4.78	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	987/1559	4.22	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	3.91	3.98	4.10	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	953/1384	3.78	4.39	4.08	4.30	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1085/1368	3.78	4.43	4.30	4.56	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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