

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: PETER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 833
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	3	4	11	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	1015/1666	4.21	4.52	4.27	4.34	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	1055/1615	4.05	4.45	4.24	4.33	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	7	3	3.38	1355/1566	3.38	4.39	4.07	4.20	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	6	4.05	870/1528	4.05	4.40	4.12	4.33	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	1032/1650	4.14	4.51	4.22	4.30	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.86	4.67	4.74	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	2	11	2	3.71	1289/1626	3.71	4.34	4.11	4.20	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	933/1559	4.48	4.65	4.46	4.49	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	1054/1560	4.70	4.87	4.72	4.81	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	9	10	4.29	952/1549	4.29	4.48	4.31	4.37	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	9	9	4.15	1064/1546	4.15	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	5	12	4.30	507/1323	4.30	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	796/1384	4.11	4.63	4.10	4.21	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	7	11	4.42	695/1378	4.42	4.75	4.29	4.42	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	731/1378	4.42	4.89	4.31	4.51	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	598/ 904	3.82	4.22	4.03	4.04	3.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 232	****	3.79	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.02	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 230	****	4.14	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.44	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 218	****	4.25	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 75	****	4.97	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 79	****	4.72	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 80	****	4.22	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	36/ 41	3.67	3.67	4.50	4.65	3.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENMG 650 8010
 Title PROJ. MAN. FUNDAMENTAL
 Instructor: PETER, JAMES
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 833
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 654 8010
 Title LEADING TEAMS AND ORG.
 Instructor: IZENBERG, ILLYS
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 834
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	4	7	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	452/1666	4.64	4.52	4.27	4.34	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	191/1406	4.90	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	509/1615	4.55	4.45	4.24	4.33	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	339/1566	4.60	4.39	4.07	4.20	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	277/1528	4.70	4.40	4.12	4.33	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.51	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.86	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.34	4.11	4.20	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	572/1559	4.73	4.65	4.46	4.49	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.87	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	410/1549	4.73	4.48	4.31	4.37	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	445/1546	4.73	4.51	4.32	4.40	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	304/1323	4.55	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	278/1384	4.73	4.63	4.10	4.21	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.89	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	266/ 904	4.45	4.22	4.03	4.04	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 5 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 10 Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		