

Course-Section: ENMG 650 01
 Title Proj. Man. Fundamental
 Instructor: Griner, Anita E.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 732
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	1	8	12	4.30	820/1447	4.30	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	633/1447	4.43	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	743/1241	4.30	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	882/1402	4.14	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	644/1358	4.22	4.41	4.11	4.26	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	8	8	3.96	861/1316	3.96	4.35	4.14	4.34	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	554/1427	4.43	4.32	4.19	4.25	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.81	4.69	4.74	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	797/1434	4.10	4.47	4.10	4.21	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	322/1387	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	264/1387	4.96	4.87	4.73	4.81	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	392/1386	4.70	4.51	4.32	4.43	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	16	4.55	615/1380	4.55	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.13	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	546/1172	4.30	4.61	4.15	4.32	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	767/1182	4.20	4.56	4.35	4.46	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	695/1170	4.35	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	52/ 66	4.43	4.43	4.58	4.71	4.43
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	31/ 65	4.71	4.71	4.42	4.64	4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	20/ 64	4.57	4.57	4.09	4.18	4.57
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: ENMG 650 01
 Title Proj. Man. Fundamental
 Instructor: Griner, Anita E.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 732
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	A	16	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	12	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 652 01
 Title Mgmt,Leadership And Co
 Instructor: Izenberg,Illysa
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 733
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	14	4.88	179/1447	4.88	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	187/1447	4.81	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.31	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	292/1402	4.69	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	132/1358	4.81	4.41	4.11	4.26	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	221/1316	4.69	4.35	4.14	4.34	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	632/1427	4.38	4.32	4.19	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.81	4.69	4.74	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	149/1434	4.77	4.47	4.10	4.21	4.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.58	4.46	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	369/1387	4.94	4.87	4.73	4.81	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	241/1386	4.81	4.51	4.32	4.43	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	349/1193	4.44	4.13	4.02	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.61	4.15	4.32	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	229/1182	4.88	4.56	4.35	4.46	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	254/1170	4.88	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	7	6	4.21	356/ 800	4.21	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.21
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.43	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	4.57	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: ENMG 652 01
 Title Mgmt,Leadership And Co
 Instructor: Izenberg,Ilysa
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 733
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	6	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 654 01
 Title Leading Teams And Org.
 Instructor: Izenberg, Illysa
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 734
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	5	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1358	4.86	4.41	4.11	4.26	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	196/1316	4.71	4.35	4.14	4.34	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	237/1427	4.71	4.32	4.19	4.25	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1434	4.83	4.47	4.10	4.21	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.58	4.46	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.51	4.32	4.43	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1380	4.86	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	455/1193	4.29	4.13	4.02	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	152/1172	4.86	4.61	4.15	4.32	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	239/ 800	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.43	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.71	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.57	4.18	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENMG 656 01
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 735
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1083/1241	3.70	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	936/1402	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	452/1358	4.40	4.41	4.11	4.26	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	362/1316	4.53	4.35	4.14	4.34	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	763/1427	4.27	4.32	4.19	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.81	4.69	4.74	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	503/1434	4.36	4.47	4.10	4.21	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	931/1387	4.60	4.58	4.46	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	630/1387	4.84	4.87	4.73	4.81	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	811/1386	4.42	4.51	4.32	4.43	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	729/1380	4.54	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	786/1193	4.02	4.13	4.02	4.02	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	344/1172	4.56	4.61	4.15	4.32	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.56	4.35	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	254/1170	4.88	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	389/ 800	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.43	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.57	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Course-Section: ENMG 656 01
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Wilson, Richard (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 735
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	3	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 656 01
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Oliver,Michael (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 736
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.35	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1083/1241	3.70	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	936/1402	4.06	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	452/1358	4.40	4.41	4.11	4.26	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	362/1316	4.53	4.35	4.14	4.34	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	763/1427	4.27	4.32	4.19	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	592/1447	4.87	4.81	4.69	4.74	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	503/1434	4.36	4.47	4.10	4.21	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1387	4.60	4.58	4.46	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	758/1387	4.84	4.87	4.73	4.81	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	607/1386	4.42	4.51	4.32	4.43	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	506/1380	4.54	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	536/1193	4.02	4.13	4.02	4.02	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	344/1172	4.56	4.61	4.15	4.32	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.56	4.35	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	254/1170	4.88	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	389/ 800	4.14	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.73	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.43	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.71	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.57	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****

Course-Section: ENMG 656 01
 Title Engr Law And Ethics
 Instructor: Oliver, Michael (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 736
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	3	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENMG 659 01
 Title Strategic Management
 Instructor: Fenton,Robert E
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 737
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	3	2	4.17	954/1447	4.17	4.51	4.31	4.46	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.35	4.27	4.30	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1120/1402	3.83	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	987/1358	3.80	4.41	4.11	4.26	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	4.35	4.14	4.34	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1123/1427	3.83	4.32	4.19	4.25	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.81	4.69	4.74	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.47	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1245/1387	3.83	4.58	4.46	4.51	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.87	4.73	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	953/1386	4.17	4.51	4.32	4.43	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.54	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.13	4.02	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.61	4.15	4.32	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	996/1182	3.80	4.56	4.35	4.46	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.67	4.38	4.52	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	290/ 800	4.33	4.21	4.06	4.10	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

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