

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 656 01
Title:	Engr Law And Ethics
Instructor:	Oliver,Michael

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	601/1528	4.54	4.11	4.31	4.45	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	477/1527	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	741/1333	4.37	4.13	4.34	4.39	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	457/1495	4.54	4.28	4.25	4.33	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	393/1439	4.48	4.20	4.11	4.24	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	466/1425	4.44	4.13	4.12	4.28	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	11	11	4.04	1026/1508	4.04	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1526	5.00	5.00	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	389/1490	4.50	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	478/1428	4.78	4.52	4.49	4.56	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	677/1436	4.87	4.87	4.74	4.83	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	19	4.57	541/1427	4.59	4.39	4.32	4.36	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	502/1425	4.60	4.40	4.34	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	654/1291	4.16	4.10	4.05	3.99	4.16
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	577/1271	4.36	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	7	14	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.42	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	0	4	16	4.55	607/1273	4.55	4.49	4.38	4.52	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	419/922	4.14	3.96	4.02	4.00	4.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 656 01
Title:	Engr Law And Ethics
Instructor:	Oliver,Michael

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.66	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 656 01
Title:	Engr Law And Ethics
Instructor:	Oliver,Michael

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	13	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 656 01
Title:	Engr Law And Ethics
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	601/1528	4.54	4.11	4.31	4.45	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	477/1527	4.59	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	741/1333	4.37	4.13	4.34	4.39	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	457/1495	4.54	4.28	4.25	4.33	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	393/1439	4.48	4.20	4.11	4.24	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	7	16	4.44	466/1425	4.44	4.13	4.12	4.28	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	11	11	4.04	1026/1508	4.04	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1526	5.00	5.00	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	328/1490	4.50	4.22	4.11	4.16	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	385/1428	4.78	4.52	4.49	4.56	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	580/1436	4.87	4.87	4.74	4.83	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	506/1427	4.59	4.39	4.32	4.36	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	6	17	4.56	600/1425	4.60	4.40	4.34	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	584/1291	4.16	4.10	4.05	3.99	4.16
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	577/1271	4.36	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	7	14	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.42	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	0	4	16	4.55	607/1273	4.55	4.49	4.38	4.52	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	419/922	4.14	3.96	4.02	4.00	4.14

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 656 01
Title:	Engr Law And Ethics
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/194	****	****	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/176	****	****	4.23	4.66	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 656 01
Title:	Engr Law And Ethics
Instructor:	Wilson,Richard

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	13	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 662 01
Title:	Fin Decision-Making Engr
Instructor:	Fenton,Robert E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	3	0	3.25	1459/1528	3.25	4.11	4.31	4.45	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1296/1527	3.78	4.32	4.28	4.36	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1198/1333	3.67	4.13	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1233/1495	3.78	4.28	4.25	4.33	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1144/1439	3.63	4.20	4.11	4.24	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1211/1425	3.50	4.13	4.12	4.28	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	681/1508	4.33	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1526	5.00	5.00	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1203/1490	3.67	4.22	4.11	4.16	3.67
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1202/1428	4.00	4.52	4.49	4.56	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	612/1436	4.88	4.87	4.74	4.83	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1080/1427	4.00	4.39	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1076/1425	4.00	4.40	4.34	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	728/1291	4.00	4.10	4.05	3.99	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	644/1271	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.27	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	805/1276	4.25	4.42	4.33	4.43	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	746/1273	4.38	4.49	4.38	4.52	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	691/922	3.60	3.96	4.02	4.00	3.60

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENMG 662 01
Title:	Fin Decision-Making Engr
Instructor:	Fenton,Robert E

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/198	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	****	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	****	4.56	4.58	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						