

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
ACC	2013	Tuo, Ling	27	55.6%	3.80	4.00	4.00	3.93	3.73	3.53	3.83	4.13	3.47	3.73	3.87	3.80	3.60	3.77
	3033	Tuo, Ling	5	80.0%	4.00	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.79	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50
	5003	Tuo, Ling	17	47.1%	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.75	4.63	4.50	4.52	4.75	4.75	5.00	4.88	4.75	4.63	4.79
	6003	Zhang, Yu	17	100.0%	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.06	4.29	4.06	4.22	4.06	3.88	4.06	4.18	4.41	4.06	4.11
ARC	1012	Schwartz, Martin	94	71.3%	4.21	4.27	4.36	3.81	4.01	4.07	4.12	4.66	4.48	4.67	4.28	4.67	4.55	4.55
	1213	Blendowski, Aaron	16	68.8%	4.45	4.36	4.82	4.45	4.91	4.82	4.64	4.82	4.73	5.00	4.73	4.91	4.91	4.85
	1213	Crutcher, Kenneth	14	85.7%	3.33	3.58	3.75	3.50	4.17	4.00	3.72	4.45	3.33	4.00	3.50	3.92	3.83	3.80
	1213	Haam, Songho	25	64.0%	4.44	4.25	4.56	4.38	4.63	4.56	4.47	4.75	4.38	4.25	4.31	4.31	4.38	4.40
	1213	Quijing, Nicholas	17	58.8%	2.60	3.50	3.20	2.70	2.60	2.40	2.83	3.20	1.90	2.60	2.40	2.80	2.00	2.48
	1223	Bales, Fernando	13	84.6%	3.82	3.55	3.91	3.64	4.00	3.91	3.80	3.73	3.09	3.64	3.45	3.64	3.55	3.52
	2116	Bales, Fernando	14	64.3%	4.00	4.11	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.33	4.15	4.44	4.11	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.22	4.19
	2116	Dean, Kristen	15	66.7%	4.10	3.90	4.20	3.60	4.30	4.10	4.03	4.30	4.10	4.40	3.90	4.10	4.40	4.20
	2116	Dechard, Elise	14	57.1%	3.71	4.20	4.29	3.43	4.71	4.14	4.06	4.38	4.25	4.50	3.63	3.88	4.25	4.15
	2116	Dewhirst, Hannah	7	42.9%	4.00	4.00	4.33	3.00	3.67	3.67	3.78	3.67	3.33	3.00	2.67	3.33	3.33	3.22
	2116	Haam, Songho	15	73.3%	3.82	3.73	4.00	3.36	4.09	4.09	3.85	4.09	4.00	3.55	3.55	4.00	3.82	3.83
	2116	Osler, Peter	21	47.6%	3.40	4.33	4.10	2.33	4.30	3.80	3.70	4.60	3.20	3.50	2.67	3.70	3.40	3.53
	2116	Wong, Margaret	14	71.4%	4.40	4.60	4.70	4.40	4.60	4.70	4.57	5.00	4.80	4.70	4.70	4.90	4.90	4.83
	2313	O'Geen, Charles	11	45.5%	4.20	4.00	4.20	4.40	4.00	4.00	4.13	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.40	4.40	4.40	4.43
	2313	Tiseo, Benedetto	9	55.6%	4.20	4.00	4.60	3.20	3.80	4.00	4.03	4.80	4.20	3.60	3.60	4.40	3.80	4.07
	2313	Ward, Eric	13	61.5%	4.63	4.25	4.50	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.35	4.88	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.65
	2323	Ward, Eric	9	66.7%	4.67	4.17	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.80	4.44	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.80	5.00	4.33	4.49
	2513	Faoro, Daniel	12	58.3%	3.57	3.57	3.43	3.29	3.29	3.43	3.43	3.71	3.57	3.29	3.71	3.57	3.43	3.55
	2513	Shih, Kelchen	12	91.7%	4.18	4.40	4.55	4.09	3.91	4.00	4.18	4.73	4.09	4.55	4.55	4.73	4.36	4.50
	2813	Bales, Fernando	17	64.7%	4.09	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.09	4.09	4.17	4.36	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.45	4.27	4.29
	2813	Dean, Kristen	16	68.8%	4.36	4.18	4.36	4.09	4.36	4.09	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.09	4.18	4.18	4.18	4.21
	2813	Jones, Aaron	16	68.8%	4.73	4.91	4.91	4.73	4.91	4.91	4.85	5.00	4.82	4.91	4.91	5.00	5.00	4.94
	2813	Sutherland, Timothy	17	52.9%	4.11	4.11	4.33	3.44	4.11	4.11	4.04	3.89	2.67	3.11	3.22	3.33	3.00	3.20
	2843	Grant, Janice	11	63.6%	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.43	4.57	4.57	4.55	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71
	3116	Blendowski, Aaron	13	61.5%	4.38	4.25	4.13	4.38	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.75	4.65
	3116	Nishikawa, Sara	11	36.4%	4.00	3.75	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.08	4.50	4.00	4.25	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.42
	3116	O'Geen, Charles	11	27.3%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	3.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.83
	3116	Schneemann, Steven	13	53.8%	4.57	4.29	4.29	4.14	4.71	4.57	4.43	4.57	4.29	3.86	4.14	4.14	4.14	4.19
	3116	Styczynski, Michael	13	69.2%	4.67	4.67	4.89	4.67	4.89	4.78	4.76	4.89	4.78	5.00	4.78	4.89	4.89	4.87
	3116	Sutherland, Timothy	20	55.0%	3.55	3.55	3.64	3.09	3.36	3.55	3.45	3.55	2.73	3.18	3.09	3.27	3.09	3.15
	3116	Swanson, Karen	7	42.9%	4.67	4.33	4.00	4.67	4.33	5.00	4.50	4.67	4.67	5.00	4.33	4.67	5.00	4.72
	3126	Bejo, Irsida	11	54.5%	3.83	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.83	3.83	3.92	4.33	4.00	4.83	4.00	4.67	4.33	4.36
	3126	Lancaster, Mary	11	54.5%	3.67	4.33	3.83	3.50	4.00	3.83	3.86	3.67	3.83	4.33	4.17	4.17	3.83	4.00
	3213	Stevens, James	3	33.3%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3423	McKale, Dennis	10	90.0%	2.89	2.67	2.56	2.56	2.11	1.89	2.44	4.44	4.44	4.22	4.33	4.11	4.33	4.31
	3423	Means, Janice	29	82.8%	2.75	3.46	3.00	2.63	2.79	2.67	2.88	3.92	2.29	2.33	2.42	3.33	2.38	2.78
	3513	Habba, Faris	24	95.8%	4.39	4.48	4.30	4.17	4.22	4.30	4.31	4.70	4.43	4.61	4.43	4.78	4.70	4.61
	3613	Gyure, Dale	37	73.0%	4.48	4.48	4.41	4.30	4.37	4.33	4.40	4.59	4.52	4.38	4.41	4.56	4.41	4.47
	3623	Hennebury, Deirdre	25	60.0%	4.67	4.53	4.60	4.47	4.53	4.53	4.56	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.69
	3823	Chidester, Jacob	8	25.0%	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.75
	3823	Oltrogge, Brian	11	72.7%	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.50	4.38	4.54	4.88	4.75	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.69
3843	Ragheb, Ashraf	8	100.0%	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.38	4.50	4.75	4.56	4.63	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.75	4.63	4.60	
4116	Kelly, Erin	11	90.9%	3.10	3.00	3.00	3.10	3.60	3.10	3.15	4.40	4.00	4.00	3.80	4.00	3.70	3.98	
4116	Kim, Joongsob	10	80.0%	4.25	4.13	4.38	3.88	4.38	4.13	4.19	4.75	4.25	4.38	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.46	
4116	Moore, Dorian	10	80.0%	4.13	3.88	4.13	3.75	3.88	3.88	3.94	4.63	4.25	4.25	4.38	4.13	4.25	4.31	
4116	Orlowski, Edward	9	77.8%	3.86	4.14	4.33	3.57	4.33	3.86	3.88	4.67	4.50	4.67	4.33	4.43	4.00	4.14	

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
ARC	4116	Plowright, Philip	11	81.8%	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.22	4.44	4.67	4.50	4.78	4.56	4.33	4.44	4.56	4.67	4.56
	4116	Styczynski, Michael	9	77.8%	4.14	4.57	4.43	3.71	4.43	4.43	4.29	4.71	4.14	4.00	4.14	4.57	4.29	4.31
	4126	Faoro, Daniel	13	61.5%	3.63	4.25	4.25	3.75	4.25	4.25	4.06	4.75	4.00	4.63	4.38	4.63	4.38	4.46
	4126	Nashlen, Thomas	13	61.5%	4.13	4.25	4.13	4.25	3.88	4.25	4.15	4.25	4.38	4.63	4.63	4.38	4.38	4.44
	4183	Gyure, Dale	26	69.2%	4.39	4.39	4.28	4.11	4.00	4.39	4.26	4.72	4.56	4.50	4.18	4.50	4.56	4.50
	4224	Orlowski, Edward	2	100.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.50	3.50	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.25
	4443	Jovanovic, Julia	14	78.6%	4.45	4.27	4.36	4.36	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.64	4.55	4.73	4.55	4.82	4.55	4.64
	4443	Oranchak, Joseph	14	78.6%	4.00	4.09	3.91	3.73	3.82	3.73	3.88	4.64	3.82	3.64	4.18	3.18	3.64	3.85
	4543	Faoro, Daniel	12	66.7%	4.00	4.25	4.13	4.00	3.13	4.13	3.94	4.63	4.00	3.88	4.13	3.75	4.00	4.06
	4543	Makkawy, Abdel	12	58.3%	3.43	3.57	3.71	3.86	3.57	3.43	3.60	4.29	4.29	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.00	4.17
	5013	Adhya, Anirban	10	60.0%	4.17	3.83	4.33	4.33	4.50	4.33	4.25	4.83	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.56
	5013	Ragheb, Ashraf	9	88.9%	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.75	4.63	5.00	4.63	4.71
	5202	Stevens, James	3	100.0%	4.67	4.67	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67
	5242	Kim, Joongsub	4	25.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	5423	Bodurow, Constance	12	75.0%	3.78	4.11	4.33	3.89	3.78	3.78	3.94	4.44	3.67	3.78	3.89	4.44	3.89	4.02
	5423	Schmehl, Shannon	12	100.0%	4.42	4.42	4.42	4.50	4.17	4.42	4.39	4.33	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.67	4.33	4.42
	5622	Keslacy, Elizabeth	5	100.0%	5.00	5.00	4.80	4.60	5.00	5.00	4.87	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	5.00	4.80	4.83
	5643	Hennebury, Deirdre	10	50.0%	5.00	4.60	5.00	4.80	4.80	4.60	4.80	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.80	5.00	5.00	4.97
	5643	Plowright, Philip	13	61.5%	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.38	4.38	4.54	4.88	4.75	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.75	4.71
	5693	Bodurow, Constance	8	87.5%	2.29	2.71	2.86	2.86	2.57	2.43	2.62	3.00	2.29	2.29	2.29	2.43	2.29	2.43
	5714	Kim, Joongsub	5	80.0%	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.29	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50
	5742	Martin, Jordan	23	56.5%	4.15	4.15	4.31	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.18	4.46	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.41
	5814	Abela, John	7	85.7%	4.67	4.50	4.67	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.83	4.83	4.81
	5814	Adhya, Anirban	7	57.1%	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.75	4.75	4.58	5.00	4.50	4.75	4.25	5.00	4.50	4.67
	5814	Bodurow, Constance	6	83.3%	2.40	2.80	3.80	2.20	3.60	3.40	3.03	3.60	2.00	2.20	2.40	4.20	2.60	2.83
	5814	Farlow, Mark	8	87.5%	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.71	4.86	5.00	4.93	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	5814	Nelson, Ralph	3	66.7%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.92
	5814	Oltrogge, Brian	11	90.9%	4.50	4.30	4.60	4.20	4.80	4.70	4.52	5.00	4.70	4.80	4.70	4.90	4.90	4.83
	5814	Shall, Scott	11	90.9%	4.50	4.30	4.60	4.20	4.80	4.70	4.52	5.00	4.90	4.90	4.70	5.00	4.90	4.90
	5814	Wang, Paul	11	54.5%	3.50	4.00	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.17	4.04	4.67	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.33	4.39
	5913	Bohde, Matthew	12	83.3%	3.70	3.60	4.10	3.80	3.60	3.70	3.75	4.00	3.40	3.50	3.70	3.20	3.70	3.58
	5913	Harmala, John	23	69.6%	4.06	4.25	4.31	4.00	4.19	4.31	4.19	4.53	4.13	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.53	4.37
	5942	Herzog, Ronald	9	100.0%	4.78	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.72	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.76
	5952	Harmala, John	8	50.0%	4.25	4.25	4.25	3.75	3.25	4.00	3.96	4.25	3.25	4.25	3.50	3.75	3.75	3.79
	6003	Oltrogge, Brian	4	50.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	6884	Nelson, Ralph	11	90.9%	4.60	4.50	4.60	4.22	4.70	4.70	4.56	4.70	4.80	4.80	4.67	4.90	4.90	4.80
	6903	Dilaura, Vicki	3	100.0%	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.33	5.00	4.67	4.78	4.33	4.67	4.67	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.60
	6883	Wang, Paul	2	100.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50
	4582	Orlowski, Edward	10	70.0%	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.14	4.14	4.29	4.19	4.57	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.43	4.57	4.52
	6833	Colon, Jason	15	46.7%	4.43	4.29	4.86	4.29	4.43	4.71	4.50	5.00	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.86	4.57	4.67
	5126	Abela, John	4	100.0%	4.25	4.50	4.75	3.50	3.25	4.50	4.13	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.00	4.75	4.75	4.58
	5126	Swartz, Natalie	4	100.0%	4.75	4.75	5.00	3.75	3.50	4.25	4.33	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.25	4.75	4.75	4.71
ARI	3113	Craig, Jack	6	83.3%	4.40	4.80	4.40	4.00	4.60	4.40	4.43	5.00	4.60	4.60	4.20	5.00	5.00	4.73
	3114	Swanson, Karen	5	60.0%	2.67	4.00	3.67	2.33	3.33	3.00	3.17	3.00	2.33	2.33	2.67	3.00	2.67	2.67
	4113	Phillips, Keith	15	66.7%	3.00	3.80	3.70	2.90	3.10	3.40	3.32	4.60	3.50	3.70	3.70	4.60	3.70	3.97
	4143	Annis-Alajaj, Nicole	8	62.5%	3.00	3.00	3.60	2.40	2.60	2.60	2.87	3.40	3.40	3.00	2.60	3.40	3.20	3.17
	4223	DiLaura, Lenard	15	100.0%	4.80	4.67	4.80	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.76	4.87	4.87	4.87	4.87	4.87	4.93	4.88
	4234	Lammers, Barbara	14	71.4%	4.20	4.00	4.00	3.80	3.60	4.00	3.93	4.20	4.20	3.60	3.80	3.60	3.70	3.85
	4922	DiLaura, Lenard	9	88.9%	4.63	4.43	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.25	4.44	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.88
	5814	Phillips, Keith	7	71.4%	3.80	3.80	3.80	3.40	4.40	4.20	3.90	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.80	3.80	4.20	3.80

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
ARI	5623	Phillips, Keith	7	85.7%	3.67	3.83	4.17	3.83	4.00	4.17	3.94	4.17	4.17	4.17	4.17	4.33	4.17	4.19
ART	1113	Dilaura, Vicki	15	93.3%	4.36	4.21	4.50	4.36	4.57	4.36	4.39	4.36	4.00	4.29	4.36	4.29	4.29	4.26
	1113	Rost, Steven	15	86.7%	4.31	4.46	4.38	3.92	4.38	4.46	4.32	4.62	4.23	4.69	4.15	4.69	4.38	4.46
	1113	Rudy, Gretchen	34	67.6%	4.74	4.52	4.65	4.52	4.78	4.78	4.67	5.00	4.78	4.74	4.65	4.96	4.91	4.84
	1113	Welch, Elizabeth	17	64.7%	4.73	4.73	4.82	4.64	4.45	4.64	4.67	4.91	4.91	4.82	4.73	4.91	4.82	4.85
	1133	Duval, Stephanie	7	100.0%	4.43	4.43	4.43	4.00	4.43	4.43	4.33	4.43	4.29	4.71	4.14	4.43	4.43	4.40
	2053	Coy, Steven	2	50.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	2113	Craig, Jack	12	66.7%	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.71	4.88	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.77
	2113	Hanna, Vance	16	75.0%	4.50	4.50	4.08	4.17	4.42	4.50	4.36	4.92	4.58	4.75	4.67	4.92	4.83	4.78
	2523	Crum, Lilian	13	84.6%	4.55	4.40	4.55	4.64	4.64	4.73	4.59	5.00	4.82	4.82	4.73	5.00	4.82	4.86
	3023	Schneider, Christopher	12	58.3%	4.29	4.17	4.14	4.00	4.29	4.00	4.14	4.71	4.29	4.14	4.00	4.71	4.29	4.36
	3063	Safioulline, Maxim	11	81.8%	2.56	3.56	3.33	2.56	3.00	2.89	2.98	4.56	3.22	3.56	3.67	4.67	3.56	3.87
	3213	Coy, Steven	11	81.8%	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.17	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.33	4.44	4.11	4.20
	3323	Grayson, Alan	7	85.7%	4.00	4.17	4.17	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.17	4.33	4.17	4.33	4.50	4.17	4.50	4.33
	3413	Mohammad, Saima	15	73.3%	3.82	3.80	3.82	3.73	3.82	3.82	3.80	3.91	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.27	4.09	4.12
	3523	Almstead, Blake	9	55.6%	4.60	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.80	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80
	3563	Welch, Elizabeth	11	72.7%	4.38	4.38	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.38	4.38	4.63	4.38	4.38	4.25	4.63	4.50	4.46
	3633	Newberry, Jessica	15	100.0%	4.53	4.80	4.67	4.67	4.47	4.67	4.63	4.87	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.87	4.67	4.80
	4514	Crum, Lilian	8	75.0%	4.67	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.50	4.50	4.47	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83
	4612	Ashton, Marshall	4	100.0%	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.25	4.21
	4612	Crum, Lilian	11	54.5%	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.50	4.33	4.39	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.83	4.83
	4922	Welch, Elizabeth	11	81.8%	4.22	4.11	4.33	4.56	4.33	4.22	4.30	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.78	4.70
	6513	Adhya, Anirban	3	33.3%	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.17
	6513	Coy, Steven	3	66.7%	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.17	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.50
	5522	Stevens, Jason	3	100.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.11	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.50
ATD	1914	Dawson, Andrew	10	50.0%	4.20	4.00	4.40	4.00	4.40	4.40	4.23	4.00	3.60	3.80	4.00	3.60	4.00	3.83
	1914	English, Derek	10	50.0%	4.20	4.20	4.60	4.20	4.60	4.60	4.40	4.60	4.00	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.40	4.33
	1914	Gilmore, Steven	10	50.0%	4.60	4.60	4.80	4.40	4.80	4.80	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	1914	Kangas, Daniel	10	50.0%	4.20	4.20	4.80	4.40	4.80	4.60	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.93
	1914	Lanyon, Jacob	10	40.0%	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25
	1914	Nagara, Keith	10	40.0%	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.71
	2813	Rider, Joseph	8	87.5%	5.00	4.86	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.98	5.00	4.86	5.00	5.00	4.86	5.00	4.95
	2813	Robie, Kyle	8	87.5%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	2816	Cooper, Stuart	8	87.5%	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.86	4.86	4.83	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86
	2816	Cowles, Paul	8	87.5%	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86
	2816	Crowley, Joseph	8	87.5%	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86
	2816	Dawson, Andrew	8	100.0%	4.25	4.57	4.38	4.50	4.38	4.13	4.33	4.38	4.25	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.50	4.38
	2816	English, Derek	8	87.5%	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.86	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.86	4.74
	2816	Lanyon, Jacob	8	100.0%	4.25	4.57	4.38	4.50	4.25	4.13	4.30	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.63	4.50	4.60
	2832	Nagara, Keith	7	85.7%	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.58	4.50	4.67	4.50	4.50	4.80	4.50	4.53
	3616	Hanzel, Andrew	6	33.3%	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.58	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.50	3.50	3.50
	3616	Huacuja, Roberto	6	16.7%	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3616	Preuss, Kevin	6	33.3%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.42	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.42
	3616	Sims, Russell	6	33.3%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50
	3616	Zhang, Jing	6	33.3%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50
	3616	Zingalie, Anthony	6	16.7%	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3716	Eash, Matthew	10	40.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.46	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.42
	3716	Ghobrial, Rimon	10	40.0%	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.42	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.46
	3716	Gould, Aaron	10	40.0%	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.29	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.42

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
ATD	4414	Graf, Benjamin	13	53.8%	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.57	4.57	4.71	4.67	4.86	4.71	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.79
	4414	Phillips, John	13	53.8%	4.00	4.00	4.14	4.00	3.71	3.57	3.90	4.57	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.00	4.21
	4513	Nagara, Keith	12	41.7%	4.00	4.20	4.20	3.80	3.80	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.43
	4516	Gaffka, Douglas	9	66.7%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.47	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.53
	4516	Hanzel, Andrew	9	55.6%	2.00	1.75	2.50	1.75	1.75	2.00	1.96	3.75	1.75	2.00	1.75	3.25	1.75	2.38
BIO	1153	Chan, Raymond	24	83.3%	4.25	4.35	4.35	4.40	4.40	4.25	4.33	4.55	4.45	4.55	4.55	4.50	4.50	4.52
	1213	Siddiq, Fauzia	26	76.9%	4.00	3.95	3.95	4.30	4.05	3.45	3.95	4.30	3.75	4.15	4.20	4.20	3.35	3.99
	1213	Zwiesler-Vollick, Julie	24	50.0%	4.67	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.50	4.42	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.49
	1221	Feng, Yi	14	57.1%	4.13	4.00	3.75	3.88	4.00	3.88	3.94	4.13	3.75	4.00	4.13	3.88	3.88	3.96
	1221	Massey, Katherine	23	47.8%	3.45	4.00	4.36	4.00	4.00	3.82	3.94	4.36	3.64	4.00	4.27	4.36	4.27	4.15
	1221	Siddiq, Fauzia	14	57.1%	4.50	4.50	4.13	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.38	4.38	3.63	4.14	4.00	3.88	3.75	3.93
	3303	Morrisette, Jeffery	17	76.5%	4.23	4.08	4.31	3.92	4.00	4.15	4.12	4.23	4.08	4.31	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.22
	4103	Zwiesler-Vollick, Julie	15	73.3%	4.45	4.55	4.55	4.45	4.45	4.64	4.52	4.73	4.55	4.55	4.55	4.73	4.73	4.64
	4912	Morrisette, Jeffery	4	100.0%	3.75	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.13	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.17
	4912	Zwiesler-Vollick, Julie	4	50.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.92
BME	2101	Aviles, Gladys	16	81.3%	4.00	4.08	4.15	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.09	4.23	4.08	4.23	4.08	4.31	4.15	4.18
	2103	Appleby, Lavetta	16	68.8%	3.55	3.36	3.18	3.91	3.64	3.64	3.55	4.45	3.18	3.64	3.82	3.27	3.55	3.65
	3002	Meyer, Eric	10	40.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.54
	3223	Nasir, Mansoor	10	30.0%	2.33	3.33	2.67	2.67	2.33	3.33	2.78	5.00	2.33	3.33	3.00	3.67	2.67	3.33
	3301	Meyer, Eric	21	57.1%	4.33	4.33	4.36	3.50	4.00	4.17	4.10	4.50	4.25	4.25	3.50	4.42	4.25	4.19
	3303	Meyer, Eric	26	57.7%	4.33	3.93	4.20	4.20	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.13	4.00	4.00	4.13	4.20	4.27	4.12
	4013	Nasir, Mansoor	18	38.9%	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.14	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.57	4.43	4.71	4.71	4.57	4.71	4.62
	4103	LeCarpentier, Gerald	11	54.5%	2.83	3.17	3.83	3.33	2.17	2.00	2.89	3.33	2.50	3.50	3.17	3.50	2.17	3.03
	4801	Li, Yawen	14	42.9%	3.67	4.50	4.67	4.00	4.40	4.40	4.22	4.67	4.33	5.00	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.69
	4803	Li, Yawen	14	42.9%	4.50	4.67	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.50	4.47	5.00	4.33	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.83	4.69
	4023	Zhou, Meng	3	66.7%	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.42	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.67
	1202	LeCarpentier, Gerald	24	54.2%	2.62	3.38	3.00	2.85	3.17	2.92	2.98	3.15	2.23	2.92	2.85	3.00	2.54	2.78
	1202	Pappas, George	14	71.4%	4.50	4.30	4.70	4.70	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.60	4.50	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.60	4.67
	1201	Pappas, George	46	65.2%	4.07	4.17	4.28	4.00	4.07	4.14	4.13	4.13	4.07	4.52	4.17	4.40	4.23	4.25
	3703	Li, Yawen	19	52.6%	4.10	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.40	4.30	4.23	4.60	4.20	4.30	4.20	4.30	4.20	4.30
5093	Nasir, Mansoor	6	66.7%	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.00	4.00	3.96	4.50	4.25	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.42	
CHM	1154	Fawaz, Remie	15	40.0%	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.17	3.83	4.00	4.17	4.67	4.17	4.17	4.17	3.83	3.83	4.14
	1154	Holubka, Joseph	18	44.4%	4.25	4.25	3.75	4.00	4.13	3.88	4.04	4.50	4.13	4.13	4.38	4.13	4.25	4.25
	1154	Karian, Harutun	14	71.4%	3.50	3.80	3.80	4.00	3.60	3.70	3.73	3.70	2.90	2.70	3.60	3.50	2.90	3.22
	1154	Madden, William	34	58.8%	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.25	4.32	4.60	4.40	4.40	4.45	4.55	4.45	4.48
	1213	Madden, William	31	58.1%	4.22	4.06	4.33	4.44	3.94	4.22	4.20	4.72	4.33	4.28	4.44	4.50	4.11	4.40
	1213	Sky, Anthony	23	52.2%	4.67	4.58	4.25	4.58	4.67	4.58	4.56	4.75	4.50	4.42	4.58	4.75	4.58	4.60
	1213	Vamvouka, Magdalini	22	68.2%	3.73	3.60	3.73	3.67	3.73	3.60	3.68	3.87	3.00	3.40	3.53	3.00	3.13	3.32
	1213	Villeneuve, Nicole	25	76.0%	4.37	4.05	4.22	4.42	4.37	4.32	4.29	4.58	4.21	4.42	4.42	4.47	4.42	4.42
	1213	Zhou, Meng	28	64.3%	4.11	4.28	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.00	4.13	4.33	3.89	4.35	4.33	4.22	4.11	4.19
	1221	Dean, Walter	19	73.7%	4.21	4.29	4.21	4.64	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.50	3.93	4.00	4.21	4.21	3.86	4.12
	1221	Holubka, Joseph	19	52.6%	4.20	3.90	4.00	4.10	4.10	4.20	4.08	4.30	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.28
	1221	Karian, Harutun	18	72.2%	4.08	3.69	3.77	4.00	4.08	3.92	3.92	3.23	3.08	3.85	3.69	3.46	3.15	3.41
	1221	Sky, Anthony	16	62.5%	4.20	4.10	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.05	4.20	3.70	3.80	3.90	4.20	4.00	3.97
	1221	Vamvouka, Magdalini	19	68.4%	3.92	3.77	3.85	4.23	4.00	3.92	3.95	3.54	3.15	3.62	4.00	3.38	3.38	3.51
	1221	Woodworth, James	11	81.8%	4.44	4.38	4.44	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.48	4.89	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.44	4.67	4.69
	1221	Zhou, Meng	19	73.7%	3.43	4.00	3.93	3.86	4.00	3.64	3.81	3.79	3.57	4.00	4.21	4.14	3.86	3.93
	2313	Timmons, Shannon	10	70.0%	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.71	4.57	4.60	4.86	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.86	4.71	4.69

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
CHM	2342	Villeneuve, Nicole	6	66.7%	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	2352	Villeneuve, Nicole	6	83.3%	4.20	4.40	4.40	4.60	3.20	3.80	4.10	4.80	5.00	4.80	4.80	5.00	4.80	4.87
	3403	Timmons, Shannon	10	90.0%	4.44	4.67	4.33	4.56	4.33	4.22	4.43	4.67	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.89	4.63	4.65
	3411	Timmons, Shannon	8	100.0%	4.63	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.38	4.50	4.63	4.75	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.50	4.60
	3423	Appleby, Lavetta	4	75.0%	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.67	4.00	4.33	4.28	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3463	Sky, Anthony	3	100.0%	3.67	3.67	4.50	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.93	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.94
	4001	Appleby, Lavetta	3	100.0%	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	4912	Timmons, Shannon	2	100.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3431	Appleby, Lavetta	3	33.3%	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
COM	0094	Awada, Abir	11	81.8%	3.78	3.89	3.67	3.22	3.56	3.33	3.57	3.38	3.63	4.00	2.89	4.22	3.44	3.55
	0094	Blackwell, Linda	14	50.0%	4.43	4.29	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.00	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.29	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.29
	0094	Flores, Anna-Maria	8	100.0%	4.63	4.38	4.38	4.38	4.25	4.63	4.44	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.88	4.88	4.75	4.79
	0094	Kao, Vivian	10	60.0%	3.83	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.17	3.67	3.94	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.33	4.25
	0094	Kustarz, Michelle	15	53.3%	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.50	4.54	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.50	4.50	4.56
	0094	Moyer, Daniel	6	16.7%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	0112	Abbas, Nawal	13	100.0%	4.23	4.01	4.15	4.17	4.23	4.15	4.20	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.08	4.15	4.31	4.31
	1001	Booker, Zsa-Zsa	65	38.5%	3.36	3.32	3.56	3.64	3.28	3.08	3.37	4.04	3.84	4.13	4.04	4.12	4.04	4.03
	1001	Craigo, Brian	18	55.6%	3.80	3.70	4.00	4.22	4.10	3.70	3.91	4.40	4.10	4.10	4.20	4.40	4.20	4.23
	1001	Faulkner, Ty	69	31.9%	3.82	3.86	4.14	3.95	3.86	3.68	3.88	4.59	4.36	4.73	4.45	4.77	4.45	4.56
	1001	Gaber, Jody	46	56.5%	4.00	4.15	4.04	4.08	3.77	3.81	3.97	4.38	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.50	4.35	4.35
	1001	Hoskins, Jason	23	26.1%	4.50	4.17	4.67	4.83	4.50	4.17	4.47	4.67	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.83	4.78
	1001	Koch, Douglass	42	28.6%	2.33	2.58	2.91	2.55	2.64	2.42	2.57	3.27	3.42	3.42	3.36	3.67	3.33	3.46
	1001	Maiseloff, Stephen	63	44.4%	4.04	4.04	4.07	4.18	3.82	3.93	4.01	4.39	4.29	4.57	4.32	4.61	4.54	4.45
	1001	Orr, Mignonne	22	81.8%	3.56	3.71	3.82	3.72	3.83	3.59	3.71	4.33	4.06	4.29	3.94	4.39	4.06	4.18
	1001	Shamir, Mirit	21	38.1%	2.88	2.88	3.13	3.38	2.50	1.88	2.77	4.00	3.50	3.88	4.00	3.50	3.63	3.75
	1103	Blackwell, Linda	20	65.0%	4.23	4.15	4.15	4.67	3.46	3.92	4.06	4.69	4.46	4.31	4.46	4.38	4.23	4.42
	1103	Brinker, Ludger	17	82.4%	4.64	4.29	4.64	4.50	4.57	4.43	4.51	4.93	4.79	4.86	4.64	4.64	4.64	4.75
	1103	Frenkel, Cindy	17	70.6%	3.58	3.83	4.33	3.91	4.42	4.25	4.07	4.67	4.17	4.50	4.33	4.83	4.42	4.49
	1103	Gordon, Aviva	17	88.2%	4.20	4.13	3.80	4.40	3.80	3.93	4.04	4.33	3.93	4.07	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.29
	1103	Grant, Leigh	19	52.6%	4.50	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.50	4.50	4.48	4.60	4.60	4.40	4.50	4.40	4.50	4.50
	1103	Hall Sturgis, Stephanie	20	65.0%	4.46	4.31	4.54	4.46	4.15	4.23	4.36	4.69	4.62	4.69	4.54	4.62	4.54	4.62
	1103	Jackson, Alanna	33	69.7%	4.09	4.09	4.04	4.04	3.83	3.91	4.00	4.22	4.04	4.04	4.09	4.30	4.17	4.14
	1103	Kao, Vivian	12	75.0%	4.67	4.56	4.78	3.89	4.22	4.56	4.44	5.00	4.33	4.78	4.00	4.89	4.67	4.61
	1103	Moyer, Daniel	56	69.6%	4.13	4.26	4.38	4.10	4.31	4.23	4.24	4.69	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.59	4.46	4.49
	1103	Phillips, Rebekah	40	57.5%	4.30	4.00	4.30	4.35	4.26	4.13	4.22	4.52	4.48	4.57	4.52	4.61	4.48	4.53
	1103	Wallace, Sharon	40	60.0%	4.21	4.13	4.42	4.38	4.21	4.21	4.26	4.42	4.21	4.54	4.38	4.46	4.33	4.39
	2103	Baker, John	21	57.1%	4.42	4.25	4.17	4.08	4.08	4.33	4.22	4.67	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.50	4.42	4.40
	2103	Danielson-Francois, Serge	17	76.5%	4.08	4.08	4.15	4.15	3.92	3.85	4.04	4.54	4.31	4.62	4.38	4.54	4.38	4.46
	2103	Dillon, Colleen	34	64.7%	4.45	4.32	4.18	4.55	4.36	4.41	4.38	4.59	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.59	4.55	4.58
	2103	Floyd, Stacha	36	50.0%	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.39	4.17	4.28	4.31	4.39	4.28	4.28	4.28	4.28	4.28	4.30
	2103	Fry, Jennifer	12	16.7%	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.83
	2103	Martz, Patricia	19	57.9%	4.36	4.36	4.36	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.26	4.64	4.27	4.09	4.18	4.18	4.00	4.23
	2103	Wojciechowski, Lea	16	50.0%	4.38	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.50	4.42	4.63	4.25	4.38	4.38	4.50	4.50	4.44
	2113	Clees, Patricia	6	50.0%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	2113	Stavish, Corinne	8	37.5%	3.67	3.33	3.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.72	4.33	4.00	3.33	3.67	4.00	3.67	3.83
	3563	Stavish, Corinne	8	62.5%	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80
	3101	Kustarz, Michelle	2	50.0%	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.50
	0111	Abbas, Nawal	23	87.0%	4.17	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.39	3.94	4.14	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.29	4.29	4.27
	0075	Brodermann, Caroline	6	83.3%	4.00	4.00	3.60	3.80	4.00	3.80	3.83	4.40	4.20	4.20	3.40	4.20	4.00	4.07
0075	Finlay, Suzanne	12	83.3%	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.40	4.56	4.20	4.30	4.40	4.30	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.40	4.43	

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
COM	5963	Mack, April	7	71.4%	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.60	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.60	4.40	4.60	5.00	5.00	4.77
	6443	Martz, Patricia	7	57.1%	3.50	3.75	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.75	4.75	4.25	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.38
CRW	2513	Lamers, Sara	7	71.4%	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.80	3.60	3.80	3.87	4.00	4.00	3.80	3.80	4.20	4.00	3.97
EAE	1081	Fazzalare, Christopher	24	66.7%	4.13	4.44	4.19	4.06	3.56	3.81	4.03	4.44	4.19	4.44	4.19	4.44	4.44	4.35
	1093	Annis-Alajaj, Nicole	7	57.1%	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.75	4.00	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.46
	3113	Annis-Alajaj, Nicole	10	70.0%	3.14	3.29	3.43	3.29	3.29	3.43	3.31	4.29	3.57	4.00	4.00	4.14	3.57	3.93
	4014	Nelson, Ralph	12	91.7%	4.91	4.82	4.91	4.64	4.45	4.82	4.76	4.73	4.73	4.91	4.55	4.91	4.91	4.79
	4113	Nowicki, Michael	11	90.9%	4.60	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.40	4.50	4.42	4.70	4.30	4.40	4.50	4.40	4.60	4.48
ECE	1011	Lobbestael, Adam	19	47.4%	4.22	4.56	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.44	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.57
	1013	Livernois, Michael	19	42.1%	4.25	4.13	4.50	4.38	3.88	4.00	4.19	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.13	4.13	4.50
	1101	Thomas, Jennifer	24	54.2%	4.31	4.23	4.46	4.00	4.23	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.31	4.08	4.38	4.38	4.38	4.32
	2103	Henson, Susan	8	87.5%	4.57	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.60	5.00	4.86	5.00	4.86	4.86	5.00	4.93
	3013	Bebawy, Mena	21	95.2%	4.00	3.65	3.85	3.63	3.75	3.80	3.79	4.05	3.20	3.40	3.00	3.30	3.55	3.42
	3324	Yuen, Edmund Ee-Mun	6	100.0%	3.67	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.50	3.83	3.75	4.50	3.67	3.67	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.89
	3424	Lobbestael, Adam	4	50.0%	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3523	Lobbestael, Adam	16	75.0%	4.33	4.08	3.92	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.17	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.17	4.42	4.42	4.33
	3723	Bebawy, Mena	10	100.0%	4.20	4.10	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.30	4.27	4.40	4.10	4.50	4.40	4.40	4.40	4.40
	3823	Bandara, Nishantha	15	93.3%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.29	4.43	4.29	4.42	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.36	4.36	4.38
	4022	Henson, Susan	24	70.8%	3.94	3.65	4.12	3.59	4.18	4.12	3.93	3.88	4.00	4.06	3.81	4.00	3.94	3.95
	4051	Tocco, John	10	70.0%	4.71	4.86	4.86	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.74	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.74
	4243	Tocco, John	18	77.8%	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.36	4.43	4.39	4.71	4.50	4.29	4.29	4.50	4.71	4.50
	4263	Karatas, Aslihan	14	100.0%	4.14	3.85	4.14	3.79	3.71	4.00	3.95	3.93	4.00	3.93	3.79	3.93	3.93	3.92
	4443	Stoops, Jason	12	83.3%	4.50	4.70	4.70	4.50	4.40	4.60	4.57	4.70	4.60	4.70	4.50	4.70	4.80	4.67
	4544	Yuen, Edmund Ee-Mun	13	92.3%	3.82	4.27	4.25	3.75	3.75	3.92	3.96	4.42	3.58	3.75	3.83	3.92	4.00	3.92
	4743	Kowalkowski, Keith	17	94.1%	4.44	4.25	4.38	4.38	3.88	3.94	4.21	4.75	4.31	4.75	4.69	4.81	4.50	4.64
	4761	Bebawy, Mena	7	85.7%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.53	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.83	4.92
	4843	Bandara, Nishantha	18	100.0%	4.33	4.28	4.44	4.28	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.61	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.44	4.44
	5113	Karatas, Aslihan	25	96.0%	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.63	4.75	4.75	4.77	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.50	4.67	4.63	4.67
	5213	Tocco, John	12	50.0%	4.83	4.67	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83
	5233	Judnic, Victor	25	76.0%	4.79	4.79	4.95	4.74	4.89	4.74	4.82	4.95	4.89	4.95	4.95	4.95	4.95	4.93
	5343	Diorka, Sandra	22	81.8%	4.44	4.28	4.39	4.33	4.17	4.44	4.34	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.61	4.44	4.50	4.48
	5773	Kowalkowski, Keith	10	100.0%	4.50	4.60	4.50	4.60	4.60	4.70	4.58	4.60	4.50	4.60	4.60	4.50	4.50	4.55
	5823	Bandara, Nishantha	25	100.0%	4.72	4.80	4.76	4.72	4.68	4.76	4.74	4.72	4.76	4.76	4.76	4.72	4.68	4.73
	6733	El-Essawi, Mohamed	17	88.2%	4.40	4.53	4.67	4.47	4.53	4.53	4.52	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.47	4.47
	4753	Kowalkowski, Keith	12	91.7%	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.82	4.55	4.73	4.71	4.91	4.64	4.73	4.73	4.82	4.73	4.76
	4011	Bandara, Nishantha	3	33.3%	4.00	4.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	4.00	3.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.50
	5223	Karatas, Aslihan	8	100.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.63	4.63	4.50	4.63	4.25	4.38	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.54
	6423	Lobbestael, Adam	4	50.0%	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.42	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.67
	5283	Najib, Tarik	16	93.8%	3.13	3.33	3.40	2.80	3.20	3.27	3.19	3.53	2.67	3.47	2.93	3.60	2.93	3.19
	4363	Yuen, Edmund Ee-Mun	10	100.0%	4.40	4.50	4.40	4.20	4.30	4.30	4.35	4.70	4.50	4.30	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50
EEE	1001	Cook, Kenneth	8	87.5%	3.71	4.00	4.43	3.43	4.43	4.29	4.05	4.86	4.00	4.57	4.57	4.71	4.43	4.52
	2111	AlGhamdi, Ali	4	75.0%	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.06	4.67	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.89
	2111	Xia, Jinjun	8	25.0%	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.17
	2114	Kolasa, William	19	36.8%	3.57	3.57	3.71	3.67	3.71	3.86	3.67	3.71	3.29	2.71	3.86	2.71	2.50	3.16
	2123	AlGhamdi, Ali	37	75.7%	3.21	2.86	3.18	3.68	3.07	2.68	3.11	3.71	3.04	3.46	3.52	3.75	3.00	3.42
	2123	Annis-Alajaj, Nicole	13	61.5%	2.38	2.25	2.88	2.75	2.00	2.00	2.38	3.38	3.25	3.38	3.38	3.25	2.88	3.25
	2214	Cloud, Michael	19	57.9%	5.00	4.82	4.82	4.73	4.82	4.73	4.82	5.00	4.91	4.82	5.00	4.82	5.00	4.92

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
EEE	2214	Jaber, Nabih	18	72.2%	4.54	4.08	4.23	4.54	4.38	4.46	4.37	4.69	4.23	4.31	4.38	4.54	4.62	4.46
	3011	Jaber, Nabih	20	45.0%	4.14	4.00	4.29	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.19	4.67	4.57	4.43	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.54
	3121	Renahan, Bridget	18	44.4%	4.38	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.50	4.50	4.46	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.54
	3124	Cloud, Michael	25	36.0%	4.67	4.56	4.56	4.44	4.44	4.56	4.54	4.56	4.67	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.67	4.59
	3221	Kenyon, Scott	14	57.1%	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.38	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.63	4.38	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.13	4.50
	3223	Kenyon, Scott	12	75.0%	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.22	4.11	4.22	4.20	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.44	4.78	4.44	4.63
	3231	Chase, Richard	21	47.6%	4.10	4.00	4.20	4.10	4.20	4.20	4.13	4.40	4.20	4.30	4.10	4.30	4.10	4.23
	3233	Chase, Richard	22	31.8%	4.00	4.14	4.00	4.00	3.86	3.86	3.98	4.43	4.14	4.14	4.29	4.14	4.14	4.21
	3311	Xia, Jinjun	17	58.8%	4.20	4.10	4.50	4.44	4.50	4.30	4.34	4.56	4.20	4.40	4.30	4.70	4.30	4.38
	3314	Xia, Jinjun	10	60.0%	4.00	4.17	3.83	3.83	3.83	4.00	3.94	4.67	4.17	4.50	4.00	4.67	4.33	4.39
	3414	Cloud, Michael	20	35.0%	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	5.00	5.00	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.90
	3422	Johnston, Richard	17	47.1%	4.75	4.75	4.63	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.60	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.88	4.88	4.88	4.94
	3511	Johnston, Richard	3	66.7%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3513	Johnston, Richard	8	62.5%	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80
	4241	Sweet, Benjamin	10	90.0%	3.33	3.44	3.56	3.50	3.44	3.11	3.39	4.44	4.00	4.22	4.13	4.56	4.11	4.23
	4243	Pappas, George	29	75.9%	3.82	4.05	3.86	3.91	3.68	3.68	3.83	4.19	4.10	4.05	4.05	3.90	3.95	4.04
	4243	Sweet, Benjamin	29	79.3%	3.70	3.70	3.91	4.00	3.57	3.57	3.72	4.43	3.78	3.73	3.86	4.26	3.87	3.99
	4253	Anneberg, Lisa	22	40.9%	3.89	4.00	4.11	4.22	4.00	3.89	4.02	4.22	4.00	4.44	4.11	4.67	4.11	4.26
	4263	Anneberg, Lisa	19	47.4%	4.11	4.33	4.44	4.33	4.11	4.44	4.30	4.56	4.44	4.78	4.56	4.67	4.44	4.57
	4323	Jaber, Nabih	7	28.6%	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	4423	Hua, Kun	15	100.0%	4.87	4.93	4.93	4.93	4.87	4.93	4.91	4.93	4.87	4.93	4.93	4.93	5.00	4.93
	4514	Lowe, Gary	11	36.4%	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.25	4.00	4.46	5.00	4.75	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.79
	4811	Jaber, Nabih	17	47.1%	3.38	3.43	3.75	3.50	3.38	3.50	3.50	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.29	4.13	4.25	4.23
	4822	Jaber, Nabih	10	80.0%	3.63	3.63	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.13	3.90	3.86	3.63	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.88	3.86
	4831	Jaber, Nabih	3	33.3%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	5274	Malik, Hafiz	9	33.3%	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.61	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.83
	5364	Anneberg, Lisa	41	48.8%	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.80	4.85	4.84	4.90	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.95	5.00	4.98
	5534	Dourra, Hussein	5	100.0%	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.40	4.40	4.40	4.60	4.20	4.20	4.60	4.20	4.37
	5534	Kolasa, William	17	88.2%	4.43	4.43	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.36	4.39	4.14	4.07	4.29	4.36	4.07	4.29	4.20
	5654	Hua, Kun	18	83.3%	4.67	4.73	4.60	4.67	4.60	4.60	4.64	4.67	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.67	4.67	4.70
	5654	Xia, Jinjun	11	63.6%	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.61	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	5204	Anneberg, Lisa	28	46.4%	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.77	4.77	4.85	4.82	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85
	5264	Chase, Richard	14	64.3%	4.56	4.33	4.56	4.44	4.56	4.56	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.33	4.43
	5144	Rakouth, Heritarianisosa	7	100.0%	4.71	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.69	4.71	4.71	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.74
	4842	Jaber, Nabih	4	25.0%	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
EEM	6753	Alwerfalli, Daw	34	85.3%	4.41	4.41	4.62	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.46	4.66	4.62	4.69	4.52	4.62	4.66	4.63
	6583	Gebara, Naji	19	73.7%	4.79	4.64	4.86	4.71	4.64	4.86	4.75	4.86	4.79	4.93	4.79	4.86	4.93	4.86
EGE	1001	Campbell, Stephanie	22	95.5%	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.81	3.67	3.62	3.85	4.10	3.95	4.24	4.00	4.00	4.24	4.09
	1001	Fletcher, Robert	23	87.0%	3.70	3.75	3.90	3.15	3.60	3.40	3.58	3.85	2.90	3.20	2.85	4.10	3.10	3.33
	1001	Gerhart, Andrew	23	60.9%	4.86	4.71	4.79	4.64	4.64	4.71	4.73	4.86	4.86	4.79	4.79	5.00	4.86	4.86
	1001	Henson, Susan	21	71.4%	3.93	4.00	3.80	4.07	3.80	3.73	3.89	4.07	3.80	4.13	4.00	4.20	4.00	4.03
	1001	Jolly, Katherine	22	77.3%	4.35	4.18	4.12	4.12	4.24	4.12	4.19	4.41	4.53	4.53	4.41	4.59	4.53	4.50
	1001	Kerns, James	18	77.8%	4.21	4.21	4.21	4.21	4.07	4.00	4.15	4.21	4.00	4.21	4.14	4.07	4.14	4.13
	1001	Lobbestael, Adam	23	39.1%	4.22	3.89	3.89	4.33	3.89	3.78	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.44	3.89	4.22	4.22	4.19
	1001	Meyer, Eric	23	47.8%	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.09	4.27	4.09	4.18	4.27	3.73	4.00	4.09
	1023	Crosbie, Gary	23	100.0%	4.43	4.35	4.52	4.61	4.26	4.43	4.43	4.65	4.30	4.39	4.57	4.57	4.35	4.47
	1023	Li, Yawen	18	44.4%	4.38	4.38	4.00	4.50	4.13	4.50	4.31	4.38	4.25	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.35
	1102	Fernandez, Vernon	17	64.7%	3.82	3.82	3.91	3.73	3.73	3.45	3.74	3.27	3.27	3.60	3.36	3.45	3.27	3.34
	1102	Stuart, Charles	21	57.1%	4.75	4.50	4.67	4.67	4.50	4.67	4.63	4.92	4.83	4.75	4.67	5.00	4.83	4.83

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
EGE	2013	Haghi-Tabrizi, Shahram	42	42.9%	4.44	4.44	4.61	4.39	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.11	4.17	4.39	4.44	4.22	4.29
	2013	Xie, Xin	40	65.0%	3.85	3.77	3.81	3.96	3.50	3.62	3.75	3.81	2.73	3.31	3.31	3.73	3.12	3.33
	2123	Bell-Huff, Cristi	23	56.5%	4.62	4.31	4.31	4.46	4.31	4.38	4.40	4.46	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.69	4.62	4.54
	2123	Morano, Heidi	29	79.3%	4.26	4.36	4.17	4.17	4.43	4.09	4.25	4.43	4.39	4.39	4.35	4.39	4.39	4.39
	2231	Pohly, Sharon	14	57.1%	4.38	4.50	4.38	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.40	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.63	4.38	4.54
	2233	Mularoni, Christopher	50	98.0%	4.00	4.10	4.18	3.90	4.02	3.94	4.02	4.41	3.94	4.41	4.12	4.39	4.22	4.25
	3003	Fletcher, Robert	18	72.2%	4.69	4.69	4.62	4.62	4.69	4.62	4.65	4.77	4.62	4.62	4.69	4.77	4.77	4.71
	3003	Marek, Stanley	32	62.5%	4.50	4.45	4.40	4.35	4.45	4.40	4.43	4.65	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.55	4.65	4.61
	3003	Samardzic, Nikolina	18	83.3%	3.33	3.33	3.40	3.40	2.60	3.27	3.22	3.80	2.80	3.53	3.27	3.47	2.93	3.30
	3012	Mullin, Thomas	39	66.7%	3.69	3.85	4.04	3.81	3.58	3.54	3.74	4.31	3.65	4.24	4.27	4.00	3.88	4.05
	3012	Pawlowski, Roger	23	47.8%	4.36	4.18	4.45	4.55	4.18	4.00	4.30	4.55	4.55	4.64	4.55	4.00	4.45	4.45
	3012	Yee, Kingman	31	80.6%	4.52	4.40	4.48	4.44	4.32	4.40	4.43	4.60	4.28	4.50	4.36	3.88	4.32	4.32
	3361	Mularoni, Christopher	22	90.9%	4.20	4.10	4.20	4.10	3.85	3.80	4.04	4.80	4.45	4.75	4.65	4.85	4.60	4.68
	3341	Reimer, Donald	2	100.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
EIE	2012	Mullin, Thomas	5	60.0%	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3023	Murray, Neil	2	100.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.75	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3033	Fernandez, Vernon	2	50.0%	3.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.83	4.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	2.33
	3043	Ogundu, Joseph	15	60.0%	4.22	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.00	3.89	4.20	4.44	4.22	4.44	4.25	4.22	4.11	4.27
	4253	Ali, Sk	4	50.0%	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.67
	4653	Karim, Ahsanul	8	100.0%	4.75	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.38	4.40	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.13	4.25	4.63	4.46
	6653	Ali, Sk	38	44.7%	4.76	4.71	4.76	4.76	4.65	4.65	4.72	4.53	4.71	4.71	4.59	4.53	4.47	4.59
	4453	Islam, Muhammad	10	80.0%	4.13	4.38	4.38	4.25	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.13	4.00	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.17
	6673	Eren, Serhat	10	90.0%	4.11	4.22	4.33	4.56	4.11	4.33	4.28	4.44	4.44	4.44	4.67	4.22	4.44	4.44
EME	2011	Yee, Kingman	37	67.6%	4.48	4.28	4.40	4.12	4.28	4.24	4.30	4.67	4.38	4.58	4.20	4.42	4.54	4.38
	2012	Mullin, Thomas	77	67.5%	4.47	4.39	4.63	4.59	4.41	4.51	4.50	4.73	4.53	4.69	4.65	4.55	4.59	4.62
	3013	Haghi-Tabrizi, Shahram	25	68.0%	3.82	3.71	3.94	4.00	3.94	3.76	3.85	4.06	3.47	4.06	4.00	4.18	3.76	3.92
	3013	Xie, Xin	25	56.0%	4.07	4.07	4.07	4.14	3.86	3.93	4.02	4.21	3.21	3.79	3.86	4.21	3.64	3.82
	3023	Alwerfalli, Daw	23	95.7%	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.29	4.32	4.32	4.35	4.59	4.45	4.41	4.41	4.55	4.45	4.48
	3023	Murray, Neil	21	71.4%	4.60	4.53	4.60	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.48	4.60	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.60	4.63
	3033	Fernandez, Vernon	10	80.0%	3.50	3.63	3.88	3.75	3.63	3.63	3.67	3.50	3.25	3.00	3.88	3.75	3.38	3.46
	3033	Pawlowski, Roger	22	50.0%	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.18	4.18	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.00	4.09	4.36	4.18	4.09	4.17
	3043	Shahwan, Khaled	33	72.7%	4.33	4.33	4.25	4.42	4.25	4.17	4.29	4.58	4.50	4.58	4.54	4.63	4.50	4.56
	3043	Xie, Xin	30	66.7%	4.25	4.30	4.40	4.40	3.85	3.95	4.19	4.25	3.80	4.00	4.20	4.25	3.75	4.04
	3123	Gerhart, Andrew	9	66.7%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.97	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3123	Liu, Liping	17	76.5%	4.31	4.46	4.50	4.46	4.08	4.08	4.32	4.23	4.08	4.46	4.46	4.31	4.31	4.31
	3133	Stuart, Charles	38	73.7%	4.57	4.68	4.68	4.57	4.57	4.68	4.63	4.82	4.71	4.75	4.75	4.79	4.79	4.77
	3214	Kerns, James	15	93.3%	4.08	3.50	4.00	4.14	4.07	3.86	3.92	4.57	4.50	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.62
	3214	Mynderse, James	15	80.0%	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.08	4.25	4.17	4.19	4.75	4.17	3.83	4.17	4.17	4.08	4.19
	3214	Patel, Krunal	15	46.7%	4.71	4.29	4.57	4.43	4.00	4.29	4.38	4.86	4.71	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.86	4.90
	3223	Nasir, Mansoor	4	50.0%	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.83	4.50	4.00	4.50	2.50	4.50	3.50	3.92
	4003	Khosrovaneh, Abolhass	23	73.9%	3.29	3.76	3.53	3.18	3.47	3.18	3.40	3.88	3.24	3.33	3.24	3.29	3.18	3.36
	4013	Arslan, Selin	28	78.6%	4.55	4.45	4.36	4.41	4.50	4.50	4.46	4.68	4.64	4.73	4.68	4.73	4.67	4.69
	4013	Kheirallah, Mike	10	70.0%	4.14	4.43	4.14	4.57	4.00	4.14	4.24	4.57	4.14	4.71	4.57	4.57	4.14	4.45
	4143	Nasser, Mohamed	34	52.9%	4.22	4.17	4.17	4.11	4.28	4.17	4.19	4.33	4.28	4.28	4.17	4.39	4.33	4.30
	4163	Williams, John	10	70.0%	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.86	4.57	4.71	4.76	4.71	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.83
	4212	Yee, Kingman	44	61.4%	4.04	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.11	3.81	4.00	4.19	4.12	4.12	4.04	3.96	4.00	4.07
	4252	Kerns, James	13	84.6%	3.73	4.20	3.82	4.09	4.09	4.18	3.99	4.73	4.73	4.64	4.64	4.64	4.73	4.68
	4252	Yee, Kingman	44	65.9%	3.48	3.64	3.76	3.86	3.71	3.66	3.67	4.03	3.97	3.97	4.07	4.03	4.03	4.01
	4333	Gill, Preetinder	32	71.9%	4.78	4.65	4.78	4.74	4.61	4.65	4.70	4.74	4.70	4.78	4.70	4.65	4.74	4.72

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor							
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average	
EME	4402	Fernandez, Vernon	16	62.5%	3.70	3.70	3.89	3.10	3.89	3.50	3.61	3.90	3.00	3.20	3.33	3.10	3.20	3.27	
	4412	Gerhart, Andrew	16	81.3%	4.77	4.77	4.77	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.72	4.77	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.77	4.77	4.76	
	4603	Jammoussi, Hassene	9	88.9%	4.13	4.13	4.38	4.38	4.25	4.00	4.21	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.44	
	4613	Pawlowski, Roger	32	62.5%	4.40	4.30	4.45	4.45	4.35	4.30	4.38	4.45	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.45	4.45	4.30	4.42
	5143	Marek, Stanley	27	70.4%	4.74	4.74	4.58	4.74	4.63	4.63	4.68	4.79	4.68	4.63	4.68	4.74	4.79	4.79	4.72
	5143	Yassine, Mahmoud	32	81.3%	4.58	4.62	4.54	4.64	4.46	4.62	4.57	4.58	4.50	4.44	4.58	4.23	4.35	4.35	4.44
	5153	Arslan, Selin	32	62.5%	4.70	4.75	4.90	4.80	4.40	4.68	4.70	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.79
	5153	Samardzic, Nikolina	27	81.5%	4.45	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.14	4.24	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.23	4.32	4.38	4.32	4.32
	5213	Jing, Wuming	30	76.7%	4.22	4.04	4.26	4.35	4.26	4.04	4.20	3.96	3.83	4.30	4.04	4.30	4.00	4.00	4.07
	5213	Kfoury, Giscard	25	88.0%	4.18	4.18	4.09	4.18	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.14	3.91	4.00	4.14	4.18	3.86	4.05	
	5253	Jammoussi, Hassene	31	93.5%	4.21	4.25	4.41	4.31	4.17	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.10	4.24	4.14	4.10	4.11	4.11	4.14
	5253	Makki, Imad	29	65.5%	4.42	4.26	4.21	4.32	4.26	4.21	4.28	4.74	4.47	4.26	4.53	4.53	4.37	4.48	
	5253	Riedel, Chris	17	94.1%	4.63	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.38	4.50	4.49	4.56	4.56	4.44	4.38	4.44	4.56	4.49	
	5363	Liu, Liping	30	50.0%	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.67	4.73	4.73	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.80	4.70	
	5373	Fletcher, Robert	31	74.2%	4.52	4.35	4.52	4.35	4.48	4.48	4.45	4.83	4.70	4.61	4.57	4.78	4.70	4.70	
	5433	DeRose, Giuseppe	31	93.5%	4.83	4.83	4.79	4.72	4.69	4.83	4.78	4.83	4.76	4.79	4.79	4.79	4.83	4.80	
	5453	Sitaram, Pattabhi	24	83.3%	4.10	4.00	4.15	3.95	3.90	3.80	3.98	4.40	3.90	4.15	3.95	3.95	3.85	4.03	
	5983	Allegretto, Gianluca	15	66.7%	4.70	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.70	4.63	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.70	4.70	4.68	
	5983	Fletcher, Robert	25	76.0%	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.42	4.58	4.53	4.51	4.63	4.63	4.58	4.53	4.53	4.53	4.57	
	5983	Ogundu, Joseph	28	71.4%	4.35	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.35	4.45	4.36	4.45	4.30	4.45	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.42	
	6333	Khosrovaneh, Abolhass	32	68.8%	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.00	4.09	3.86	4.02	4.18	4.09	4.18	4.09	4.18	3.91	4.11	
	6543	Koutsavdis, Evangelos	22	59.1%	4.00	4.31	4.62	4.38	4.31	4.23	4.31	4.46	4.38	4.54	4.54	4.54	4.54	4.50	
	6553	Sitaram, Pattabhi	8	62.5%	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.70	5.00	4.60	4.80	4.80	5.00	4.80	4.83	
	6623	Makki, Imad	22	95.5%	4.29	4.48	4.29	4.33	4.14	4.19	4.29	4.57	4.38	4.45	4.43	4.38	4.48	4.45	
	7213	Schihl, Peter	36	66.7%	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.63	4.75	4.54	4.63	4.75	4.75	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.67	4.72	
	7543	Koutsavdis, Evangelos	13	61.5%	4.38	4.38	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.50	4.52	4.38	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.50	4.40	
	5333	Riedel, Chris	29	75.9%	4.59	4.50	4.64	4.68	4.91	4.73	4.67	4.77	4.68	4.68	4.64	4.64	4.77	4.70	
	5513	Alwerfalli, Daw	35	91.4%	4.50	4.47	4.47	4.53	4.41	4.34	4.45	4.66	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.53	4.47	4.55	
	6283	Jawad, Badih	20	70.0%	4.21	4.14	4.14	4.14	4.07	4.21	4.15	4.21	4.07	4.14	4.07	4.21	4.21	4.15	
	6983	Shahwan, Khaled	18	88.9%	4.69	4.63	4.63	4.44	4.56	4.56	4.58	4.69	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.75	4.75	4.71	
6983	Shakiba-Herfeh, Mohammad	12	91.7%	4.27	4.18	4.27	4.36	4.36	4.36	4.30	4.82	4.45	4.45	4.55	4.55	4.55	4.56		
EMS	5603	Ali, Sk	35	45.7%	4.69	4.63	4.81	4.69	4.75	4.75	4.72	4.75	4.63	4.81	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.74	
	7103	Nasser, Mohamed	11	72.7%	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.25	4.75	4.50	4.56	4.75	4.88	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.73	
	7203	Shortt, Duane	8	87.5%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.86	4.98	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.86	5.00	4.98	
ERE	3014	Jing, Wuming	5	60.0%	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.28	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	
	3114	Kfoury, Giscard	4	50.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	
	4014	Jing, Wuming	11	72.7%	3.88	4.25	4.38	4.13	4.13	4.38	4.19	4.50	4.13	4.50	4.00	4.63	4.50	4.38	
	4113	Fernandez, Vernon	11	81.8%	2.22	2.78	2.56	2.00	2.22	2.00	2.30	2.00	1.44	2.56	1.33	2.33	1.33	1.83	
ESL	0332	Jawad-Abushaar, Ragette	2	100.0%	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	3.50	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.25	
	0432	Mirza, Megan	6	50.0%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.61	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	
	0642	Bennett, Douglas	2	100.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
	0642	Page, Raymond	7	100.0%	4.83	4.67	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.81	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.83	
	0622	Berri, Sarah	7	100.0%	4.71	4.71	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.74	4.71	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.86	4.81	
	0542	Berri, Sarah	4	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
	0142	Corp, Scott	8	100.0%	5.00	4.88	5.00	4.88	5.00	5.00	4.96	4.88	5.00	5.00	4.88	5.00	5.00	4.96	
	0242	Corp, Scott	9	66.7%	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.83	4.75	
	0242	Jawad-Abushaar, Ragette	6	100.0%	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.94	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.97	
	0342	Corp, Scott	7	71.4%	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.60	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.70	

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
ESL	0342	Jawad-Abushaar, Ragette	6	100.0%	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.50	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.50	4.64
	0222	Edward, Pauline	7	100.0%	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.67	4.71	4.86	4.71	4.86	4.71	4.86	4.79
	0422	Hamana - Nettles, Souad	7	100.0%	4.57	4.71	4.71	4.43	4.71	4.57	4.62	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.86	4.74
	0322	Jawad-Abushaar, Ragette	5	100.0%	4.80	4.80	5.00	4.80	5.00	5.00	4.90	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	0122	Lampis, Giulia	7	100.0%	4.71	4.71	4.57	4.57	4.50	4.43	4.60	4.86	4.86	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.76
	0522	Revels, Teresa	5	100.0%	5.00	4.80	5.00	4.80	5.00	4.80	4.89	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	0442	Theisen, Mary Lou	11	81.8%	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.96	4.89	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.98
FIN	3103	Tsebro, Pavlo	12	58.3%	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86
	3113	Tsebro, Pavlo	3	66.7%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	
FSC	1214	Siddiq, Fauzia	19	78.9%	4.40	4.33	4.47	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.32	4.40	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.40	4.27	4.31
	1214	Woodworth, James	19	89.5%	4.53	4.47	4.65	4.59	4.29	4.29	4.47	4.65	4.65	4.65	4.65	4.29	4.53	4.57
GAM	2123	Ashton, Marshall	9	77.8%	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.38	4.71	4.29	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.71	4.57
	2213	Ashton, Marshall	17	58.8%	4.30	4.40	4.50	4.00	4.30	4.40	4.32	4.80	4.33	4.50	4.20	4.80	4.70	4.56
	4514	Ashton, Marshall	5	80.0%	4.00	4.25	4.25	3.75	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.75	4.00	4.50	4.25	5.00	4.50	4.50
GLG	1103	Thomas, David	24	62.5%	4.67	4.67	4.60	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.56	4.93	4.67	4.80	4.60	4.87	4.60	4.74
HRM	3023	Cole, Matthew	30	63.3%	4.53	4.58	4.47	4.53	4.21	4.37	4.45	4.79	4.53	4.58	4.58	4.58	4.63	4.61
IDD	1113	Nagara, Keith	19	52.6%	3.90	4.22	4.20	3.70	4.70	4.50	4.20	4.50	3.90	4.50	3.90	4.30	4.20	4.22
	1114	Dawson, Andrew	7	57.1%	4.75	4.25	4.50	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.46	5.00	4.75	4.75	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.92
	1114	English, Derek	7	42.9%	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.61	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	1114	Heyne, David	7	42.9%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	1114	Lanyon, Jacob	7	42.9%	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	1114	Nagara, Keith	7	42.9%	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.56	4.67	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.56
	2213	Graf, Benjamin	8	50.0%	4.75	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	4.88	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	2216	Dawson, Andrew	8	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00
	2216	English, Derek	8	75.0%	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.97	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.92
	2216	Grant, Lindsey	8	62.5%	4.80	4.60	4.60	4.60	5.00	4.60	4.70	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	2216	Kijanka, Rob	8	62.5%	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.57	5.00	4.40	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.70
	2216	Lanyon, Jacob	8	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.50	4.33	4.00	4.50
	2216	Levich, Michael	8	75.0%	1.17	3.00	2.33	2.33	1.50	1.50	1.97	3.17	1.50	2.00	1.50	1.33	1.50	1.83
	2216	Palazzolo, Joseph	8	62.5%	4.80	5.00	4.80	5.00	4.80	5.00	4.90	5.00	5.00	4.20	5.00	4.60	5.00	4.80
	3316	McMillan, Andrew	6	50.0%	3.33	4.33	3.67	3.67	3.67	4.00	3.78	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.83
	3316	Mikalauskas, Christopher	6	50.0%	3.67	4.33	4.00	3.67	3.67	4.00	3.89	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.83
	4516	McMillan, Andrew	3	66.7%	4.00	2.50	3.00	4.00	3.50	2.50	3.25	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.75
	4516	Mikalauskas, Christopher	3	66.7%	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	2.50	3.25	4.50	4.50	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.50	4.67
	4516	Nagara, Keith	4	25.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	4526	Nagara, Keith	2	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
INT	3103	Alexandris, Athanasios	20	80.0%	4.81	4.81	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.76	4.94	4.88	4.81	4.88	4.88	5.00	4.90
	3603	Shah, Nipa	22	54.5%	3.67	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.75	3.50	3.69	3.33	3.33	3.08	3.17	3.25	3.08	3.21
	3803	Ku, Chih	7	71.4%	4.60	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.00	3.80	4.13	4.40	4.20	4.20	4.00	4.40	4.20	4.23
	4203	Hsiao, Shih-Hui	23	78.3%	4.06	4.00	4.33	4.06	4.11	4.17	4.12	4.22	4.11	4.39	4.28	4.39	4.33	4.29
	4303	Neary, John	4	100.0%	4.25	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.42	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.63
	5024	Grembi, Jason	13	92.3%	4.67	4.67	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.71	4.67	4.67	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.75	4.71
	6043	Kohnke, Anne	29	65.5%	4.68	4.63	4.63	4.21	4.47	4.47	4.52	4.74	4.53	4.58	4.16	4.58	4.53	4.52
	6113	Kohnke, Anne	8	50.0%	4.50	4.75	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.25	4.33	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.00	4.25	4.25	4.42

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
INT	6113	Ku, Chih	18	94.4%	4.29	4.35	4.47	4.29	4.35	4.24	4.33	4.35	4.24	4.41	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.28
	6123	Caushaj, Eralda	24	54.2%	4.69	4.77	4.92	4.69	4.77	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.46	4.62	4.69	4.69	4.54	4.62
	6123	Kohnke, Anne	14	64.3%	4.33	4.44	4.33	3.67	4.11	4.11	4.17	4.33	4.11	4.33	4.00	4.22	4.11	4.19
	6143	Evans Mach, Patrick	17	94.1%	4.88	4.88	4.81	4.81	4.81	4.88	4.84	4.81	4.88	4.88	4.81	4.94	4.88	4.86
	6253	Taleb, Hassan	13	100.0%	4.67	4.58	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.42	4.62	4.54	4.54	4.38	4.38	4.54	4.50
	7213	Ku, Chih	23	100.0%	3.95	4.09	4.04	4.09	4.17	4.04	4.04	4.43	4.09	4.39	4.39	4.48	4.26	4.34
	7223	Caushaj, Eralda	18	55.6%	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.20	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.20	4.40	4.40	4.30	4.20	4.20	4.28
	7513	Hsiao, Shih-Hui	30	93.3%	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.32	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.18	4.14	4.21	4.14	4.29	4.11	4.18
	7593	Caushaj, Eralda	19	68.4%	4.23	4.00	4.15	4.15	4.08	4.15	4.13	4.15	3.92	4.31	4.54	4.23	4.31	4.24
	2134	Grembi, Jason	13	76.9%	4.50	4.40	4.40	4.60	4.20	4.40	4.42	4.60	4.60	4.50	4.60	4.50	4.50	4.55
7263	Dillard, Terrance	18	83.3%	4.87	4.73	4.87	4.87	4.80	4.87	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.87	4.87	4.73	4.80	
LDR	2001	Coratti, Anthony	15	60.0%	3.44	4.33	4.22	3.89	3.78	3.89	3.93	4.00	4.11	4.11	4.44	4.00	4.11	4.13
	2001	Craig, Brian	20	65.0%	3.67	3.92	3.85	3.77	3.54	3.62	3.73	4.23	3.69	4.23	4.15	4.54	4.38	4.21
	2001	Duranceau, Claudia	22	50.0%	4.30	4.00	4.30	4.56	4.33	3.40	4.03	4.60	4.50	4.60	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.63
	2001	Faulkner, Ty	27	59.3%	4.44	4.44	4.38	4.50	3.88	4.13	4.29	4.69	4.63	4.69	4.69	4.88	4.69	4.71
	2001	Jolly, Katherine	18	72.2%	3.69	3.69	3.92	4.15	4.00	3.62	3.85	3.73	3.55	3.18	3.73	3.18	3.36	3.45
	2001	Nagara, Keith	15	46.7%	3.86	3.43	3.57	3.57	3.57	4.00	3.67	4.29	4.00	4.29	3.86	4.14	4.29	4.14
	2001	Randall, Matthew	9	55.6%	3.80	3.80	4.20	3.80	3.80	3.80	3.87	4.40	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.60	4.20	4.27
	2001	Shamir, Mirit	32	50.0%	3.81	3.81	3.94	3.94	3.75	3.31	3.76	4.50	4.31	4.19	4.13	4.25	4.25	4.27
	2001	Thompson, VaNessa	19	73.7%	4.71	4.71	4.36	4.57	4.43	4.57	4.56	4.50	4.57	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.64	4.65
	3000	Craig, Brian	217	57.6%	3.73	3.58	3.71	3.66	3.43	3.29	3.56	3.95	3.91	3.87	3.92	3.96	3.95	3.92
4000	Duranceau, Claudia	56	51.8%	3.62	3.61	3.61	3.69	3.36	3.03	3.49	3.93	3.89	4.00	3.96	4.04	3.93	3.97	
4000	Nation, Christopher	48	75.0%	4.31	4.19	4.22	4.42	4.22	3.83	4.20	4.71	4.69	4.72	4.67	4.74	4.74	4.70	
LLT	1213	Brinker, Ludger	17	82.4%	4.57	4.36	4.57	4.57	4.29	4.36	4.45	4.50	4.50	4.57	4.57	4.64	4.57	4.56
	1213	Finkelman, Louis	39	59.0%	4.48	4.48	4.57	4.48	4.52	4.39	4.49	4.78	4.70	4.65	4.57	4.78	4.65	4.69
	1213	Schantz, Randy	19	52.6%	3.70	3.70	4.00	3.10	3.60	3.40	3.57	4.10	3.90	3.50	2.80	2.80	3.20	3.38
	1213	Weinstein, Melinda	58	46.6%	3.70	3.85	3.81	3.56	3.70	3.56	3.70	4.15	3.89	3.89	3.70	4.04	3.93	3.93
	1223	Frenkel, Cindy	13	61.5%	4.38	4.25	4.50	4.00	4.38	4.50	4.33	4.88	4.38	4.63	3.63	4.88	4.50	4.48
	1223	Jausen, Paul	38	92.1%	4.54	4.37	4.37	4.34	4.29	4.31	4.37	4.69	4.57	4.63	4.51	4.74	4.66	4.63
	1223	Kustarz, Michelle	19	57.9%	4.27	4.45	4.18	4.30	4.20	4.27	4.27	3.91	4.50	4.45	4.73	4.36	4.45	4.39
	1223	Powell, Jeffrey	19	63.2%	4.25	4.25	4.42	4.33	4.00	4.08	4.22	4.75	4.58	4.42	4.58	4.58	4.58	4.58
	1223	Weiss, Daniel	18	66.7%	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.50	4.33	4.58	4.56	4.92	4.58	4.67	4.50	4.83	4.75	4.71
	1223	West, Anna	33	57.6%	4.32	4.21	4.21	4.32	3.84	4.05	4.16	4.58	4.42	4.42	4.42	4.53	4.47	4.47
	4513	Stavish, Corinne	5	60.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	4523	Lamers, Sara	25	76.0%	4.58	4.58	4.63	4.37	4.53	4.37	4.51	4.68	4.37	4.53	4.32	4.63	4.42	4.49
	4533	Jausen, Paul	19	94.7%	4.78	4.83	4.83	4.61	4.78	4.83	4.78	5.00	4.89	4.89	4.78	4.94	4.94	4.91
	4913	Weinstein, Melinda	17	58.8%	3.90	4.11	3.80	3.50	3.30	3.70	3.70	4.50	3.90	4.10	3.90	4.40	3.80	4.10
	MBA	5013	Cole, Matthew	7	42.9%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
6003		Tsebro, Pavlo	7	57.1%	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.71	4.75	4.50	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.75
6013		Cole, Matthew	5	60.0%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.56
6023		Marx, Thomas	21	42.9%	4.89	4.89	4.78	4.89	4.89	4.89	4.87	5.00	4.89	4.89	4.89	4.89	4.89	4.91
6043		Castelli, Patricia	41	48.8%	4.80	4.60	4.65	4.70	4.55	4.60	4.65	4.85	4.80	4.85	4.80	4.85	4.85	4.83
6043		Marx, Thomas	5	60.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
6053		Higginson, James	6	50.0%	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.17
6053		Verma, Swati	5	80.0%	4.75	4.25	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.75	5.00	4.75	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.92
6053		Zhu, Jianjun	13	61.5%	4.75	4.63	4.75	4.50	4.38	4.63	4.60	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.56
6063		Raghavan, Srikant	17	35.3%	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.58	4.83	4.83	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.83	4.89
6073	Omrani, Massood	7	71.4%	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.00	4.40	4.40	4.27	4.80	4.60	4.60	4.40	4.80	4.80	4.67	

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course						The Instructor							
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
	7033	Stavros, Jacqueline	12	66.7%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.88	5.00	4.98	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	7053	Castelli, Patricia	14	78.6%	4.82	4.82	4.82	4.82	4.82	4.82	4.82	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.91	4.91	4.91	4.95
	7063	Allen, Victor	21	100.0%	4.62	4.57	4.38	4.43	4.38	4.48	4.48	4.71	4.67	4.57	4.50	4.71	4.71	4.65
	7063	Drommi, Antonio	26	61.5%	4.69	4.56	4.69	4.81	4.63	4.63	4.67	4.81	4.69	4.75	4.81	4.56	4.75	4.73
	5031T	Swiantek, Cynthia	31	38.7%	4.58	4.45	4.73	4.67	4.17	4.33	4.44	4.50	4.42	4.08	4.50	4.42	4.42	4.39
	5041T	Swiantek, Cynthia	19	57.9%	4.73	4.73	4.82	4.73	4.55	4.55	4.68	4.64	4.55	4.64	4.73	4.73	4.55	4.64
	5051T	Zhang, Yu	42	71.4%	3.73	3.77	3.70	3.97	3.87	3.63	3.78	4.10	3.63	3.86	4.03	3.93	3.73	3.85
MCO	1003	Gaber, Jody	10	90.0%	4.44	4.22	4.33	4.44	4.11	4.38	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.44	4.44	4.44	4.44	4.43
	2003	Hopkins, Thomas	10	70.0%	4.57	4.29	4.57	4.00	4.29	4.43	4.36	4.71	4.29	4.29	4.29	4.57	4.43	4.43
	2543	Swantek, Beth	13	61.5%	4.38	4.38	4.63	3.88	4.63	4.50	4.40	4.75	4.50	4.75	4.25	4.63	4.50	4.56
	2563	Raj, Roop	9	55.6%	4.60	4.40	4.60	3.80	4.60	4.40	4.40	4.60	4.20	4.60	4.00	4.80	4.20	4.40
	3303	Swantek, Phillip	14	50.0%	4.57	4.71	4.57	4.43	4.57	4.71	4.60	4.71	4.57	4.43	4.43	4.71	4.43	4.55
	3633	Evans, Karen	9	77.8%	4.00	4.14	4.29	4.00	4.29	4.43	4.19	4.43	4.29	4.43	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.31
	3643	Anderanin, Paula	16	62.5%	3.40	4.00	3.70	3.60	3.50	3.50	3.62	4.40	3.70	3.80	3.80	4.00	4.10	3.97
	4073	Offen, Gail	12	66.7%	5.00	5.00	4.88	4.75	5.00	4.88	4.92	5.00	5.00	4.88	4.75	5.00	4.88	4.92
	4073	Ward, Michael	12	66.7%	5.00	4.88	4.75	4.63	4.75	4.75	4.79	4.88	4.75	4.88	5.00	4.88	4.88	4.88
	3913	Gaber, Jody	2	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	4933	Gaber, Jody	2	100.0%	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
MCS	0044	Husseini, Ghassan	15	66.7%	4.60	4.40	4.70	4.20	4.60	4.78	4.53	4.80	4.60	4.70	4.70	4.60	4.80	4.70
	0044	Jadoun, Naela	14	42.9%	3.83	3.83	3.83	4.17	3.50	3.83	3.83	3.83	3.83	4.00	3.83	3.83	4.00	3.89
	0054	Morris, John	51	60.8%	4.39	4.39	4.35	4.35	4.35	4.19	4.34	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.33	4.13	4.29	4.25
	0054	Nelson, Patrick	51	58.8%	3.77	3.60	3.53	3.55	3.67	3.43	3.58	3.83	3.67	3.57	3.73	3.43	3.50	3.61
	0054	Timbre, Keith	22	59.1%	4.54	4.38	4.69	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.51	4.69	4.38	4.54	4.46	4.54	4.54	4.53
	1003	Daod, Nadera	14	42.9%	3.67	3.50	3.67	3.00	2.83	3.33	3.33	3.67	2.67	2.67	3.00	3.17	3.00	3.03
	1003	Shaba, Amal	11	100.0%	4.73	4.64	4.55	4.73	4.55	4.55	4.62	4.73	4.64	4.45	4.73	4.64	4.91	4.68
	1113	Coval, Brad	7	42.9%	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.72	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	1123	Coval, Brad	16	31.3%	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.70	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.63
	1142	Azar, Ghassan	19	57.9%	3.70	3.80	3.60	3.90	3.90	3.60	3.75	4.09	3.55	3.64	3.64	3.82	3.55	3.71
	1142	Beyer, Cameron	15	60.0%	2.13	2.38	2.00	1.75	2.29	2.13	2.10	1.33	1.33	1.56	1.22	1.33	1.22	1.33
	1142	Farrehi, Khashayar	19	63.2%	4.33	4.58	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.00	4.36	4.42	4.08	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.33	4.43
	1142	Fawcett, David	19	63.2%	3.83	3.50	4.00	3.67	3.67	3.50	3.69	4.42	3.58	4.08	4.17	3.91	3.58	3.95
	1142	Stein, Gordon	21	71.4%	4.60	4.20	4.53	4.33	4.53	4.60	4.47	4.73	4.60	4.60	4.40	4.67	4.60	4.60
	1142	Zurawski, Erik	19	36.8%	4.71	4.57	4.71	4.86	4.57	4.83	4.70	4.71	4.86	4.57	4.86	4.57	4.71	4.71
	1203	Youkhana, Samer	10	80.0%	4.13	4.38	4.38	3.88	3.86	3.38	4.00	4.13	3.75	4.50	4.25	4.63	4.14	4.23
	1214	Rosen, Michael	5	40.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.17
	1214	Vaynberg, Yelena	25	84.0%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.76	4.43	4.71	4.65	4.62	4.48	4.71	4.76	4.81	4.71	4.68
	1224	Alyass, Kussiy	20	60.0%	3.67	4.08	4.17	4.17	3.83	3.25	3.86	4.08	3.33	3.33	3.33	2.83	3.25	3.36
	1224	Jadoun, Naela	19	31.6%	4.33	3.67	4.33	4.00	4.17	4.17	4.11	4.33	3.83	4.50	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.17
	1414	Alyass, Kussiy	25	64.0%	3.88	3.94	4.06	3.81	3.63	3.69	3.83	4.38	3.25	3.38	3.50	2.75	3.13	3.40
	1414	Arlinghaus, Frank	30	40.0%	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.67	3.42	3.50	3.74	4.58	3.25	3.75	3.83	3.25	3.33	3.67
	1414	Carter, Sharon	30	83.3%	4.56	4.64	4.64	4.64	4.32	4.60	4.57	4.80	4.76	4.72	4.76	4.84	4.72	4.77
	1414	Cartwright, Christopher	30	40.0%	4.67	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.33	4.58	4.63	4.92	4.75	4.58	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.69
	1414	Yu, Na	144	61.1%	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.38	4.24	4.26	4.28	4.42	4.35	4.33	4.36	4.37	4.29	4.32
	1414	Zhu, Guang-Chong	29	86.2%	4.56	4.48	4.48	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.39	4.76	4.44	4.56	4.44	4.60	4.52	4.55
	1424	Bauer, Glen	32	56.3%	4.72	4.78	4.67	4.56	4.56	4.61	4.65	4.89	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.83	4.83	4.81
	1424	Dabkowski, Michael	17	64.7%	4.27	4.20	4.27	4.45	4.36	4.09	4.27	4.82	4.64	4.73	4.73	4.82	4.80	4.74
	1424	Turfe, Atallah	14	57.1%	4.00	3.63	4.13	4.00	3.63	3.38	3.79	4.25	3.75	3.63	3.63	3.50	3.50	3.71
	1424	Yu, Na	82	61.0%	4.06	4.04	3.98	4.02	4.08	3.94	4.02	4.09	4.15	4.17	4.09	4.09	4.07	4.11

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
	1514	Azar, Ghassan	9	22.2%	3.00	3.00	4.50	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.58	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	3.75
	1514	Shaba, Amal	11	81.8%	4.33	4.11	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.22	4.33	4.56	4.44	4.63	4.67	4.22	4.44	4.47
	1524	Vaynberg, Yelena	12	58.3%	4.00	3.57	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.14	4.14	4.29	4.29	4.14	4.19
	1643	Mills, Hans	44	59.1%	4.73	4.62	4.62	4.73	4.62	4.54	4.64	4.77	4.73	4.81	4.73	4.88	4.77	4.78
	2193	Evans, Bryce	8	75.0%	4.33	4.33	4.00	3.17	4.33	4.17	4.06	4.67	4.50	4.83	4.33	4.83	4.83	4.67
	2313	Husseini, Ghassan	12	50.0%	4.83	4.67	4.50	4.67	4.83	4.50	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.42
	2313	Kana, Ayman	13	15.4%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	2414	Cartwright, Christopher	29	65.5%	4.58	4.63	4.58	4.47	4.21	4.58	4.51	4.58	4.58	4.53	4.47	4.58	4.47	4.54
	2414	Dabkowski, Michael	25	72.0%	4.50	4.33	4.28	4.33	4.11	4.39	4.32	4.89	4.44	4.56	4.56	4.83	4.50	4.63
	2414	Turfe, Atallah	19	57.9%	4.00	4.27	4.36	4.00	3.73	4.00	4.06	4.00	3.55	3.80	4.00	3.27	3.09	3.60
	2414	Yu, Na	30	53.3%	4.63	4.56	4.56	4.44	4.63	4.56	4.56	4.81	4.81	4.88	4.81	4.69	4.88	4.81
	2423	Michaels, James	28	60.7%	4.47	4.41	4.53	4.53	4.41	4.41	4.46	4.59	4.65	4.53	4.53	4.53	4.65	4.58
	2423	Nelson, Patrick	30	60.0%	4.72	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.83	4.78	4.78	4.94	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.72	4.78	4.77
	2423	Zhu, Guang-Chong	10	100.0%	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.37	4.90	4.50	4.50	4.70	5.00	4.30	4.65
	2514	Azar, Ghassan	12	83.3%	4.00	4.20	4.20	3.90	4.20	4.30	4.13	3.90	3.80	4.40	3.90	4.20	4.10	4.05
	2514	Fawcett, David	16	56.3%	3.89	3.33	3.89	4.00	4.11	4.22	3.91	4.33	4.56	4.67	4.56	4.33	4.56	4.50
	2514	Stein, Gordon	15	33.3%	4.40	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.20	4.20	4.43	4.80	4.40	4.60	4.80	4.80	4.40	4.63
	2523	Cartwright, Christopher	18	66.7%	4.67	4.67	4.42	4.67	4.00	4.50	4.49	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.83	4.50	4.72
	2534	Fawcett, David	12	58.3%	4.71	4.57	4.57	4.86	4.71	4.57	4.67	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.43	4.57	4.71	4.71
	3324	Bukaita, Wisam	9	100.0%	3.89	4.22	4.56	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.17	4.44	4.44	4.67	4.33	4.44	4.44	4.46
	3403	Carter, Sharon	28	64.3%	4.67	4.56	4.44	4.61	4.39	4.50	4.53	4.78	4.56	4.67	4.67	4.72	4.61	4.67
	3403	Vaynberg, Yelena	59	91.5%	3.78	3.98	4.13	3.79	3.87	3.67	3.86	3.80	3.91	4.23	4.15	4.15	3.96	4.02
	3403	Zalzali, Michael	23	52.2%	4.17	3.92	3.83	3.83	3.92	3.83	3.92	4.50	4.08	3.92	4.00	4.09	4.17	4.13
	3413	Arlinghaus, Frank	26	30.8%	4.00	3.75	4.38	4.13	4.25	4.00	4.08	4.63	4.00	4.00	3.88	4.38	4.00	4.15
	3543	Al Hamando, Mazin	18	50.0%	4.44	4.22	4.11	4.56	4.22	4.38	4.29	4.33	4.22	3.89	4.44	4.22	4.33	4.24
	3563	Evans, Bryce	20	65.0%	4.31	4.45	4.54	4.38	4.58	4.54	4.46	4.62	4.69	4.85	4.54	4.85	4.85	4.73
	3633	Al Hamando, Mazin	18	33.3%	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.17	4.17	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.17	4.17	4.33	4.00	4.17	4.22
	3633	Farrehi, Khashayar	18	44.4%	4.43	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.29	4.14	4.34	4.57	4.29	4.71	4.14	4.29	4.43	4.40
	3663	Cally, John	22	45.5%	4.00	4.10	3.80	3.90	4.00	3.95	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.44	4.44	4.11	4.10	4.07
	3673	Haddad, Kamel	7	85.7%	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.81	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.78
	3723	Dabkowski, Michael	11	90.9%	4.80	4.50	4.70	4.40	4.70	4.50	4.60	4.90	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.90	4.70	4.78
	3863	Bukaita, Wisam	30	96.7%	4.62	4.66	4.55	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.50	4.69	4.48	4.83	4.66	4.62	4.66	4.66
	3863	Rosen, Michael	25	60.0%	3.27	3.60	3.67	3.87	3.60	3.53	3.59	3.87	3.53	3.79	3.87	4.40	3.80	3.88
	4643	Al Hamando, Mazin	8	75.0%	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.17	2.50	2.50	2.53	2.67	2.00	2.67	2.67	2.67	2.17	2.47
	4663	El-Bathy, Mohammed	12	91.7%	4.00	3.82	3.36	3.36	3.82	3.73	3.68	3.70	3.64	3.82	3.55	3.82	3.60	3.65
	4833	Shamir, Lior	9	33.3%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	4843	Shamir, Lior	4	75.0%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.56
	5403	Chung, Chan-Jin	4	50.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50
	5403	Ruszała, Jonathan	4	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.92	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	5703	El-Bathy, Mohammed	5	80.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	5993	Dillard, Terrance	4	75.0%	4.67	4.67	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.72	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33
	5993	Nolan, Godfrey	4	100.0%	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.42	4.75	4.25	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.25	4.50
	7013	Shamir, Lior	3	33.3%	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.83
	7033	Shamir, Lior	3	100.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.94
	2124	Lowry, Pamela	10	70.0%	4.43	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.29	4.57	4.40	4.29	4.43	4.29	4.43	4.43	4.57	4.40
	2124	Zalzali, Michael	20	85.0%	4.47	4.49	4.53	4.41	4.59	4.53	4.52	4.76	4.53	4.53	4.65	4.59	4.53	4.60
	4623	Givental, Gary	7	71.4%	4.80	4.20	4.80	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.67	4.80	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.73
	4623	Sweet, Benjamin	12	75.0%	3.89	3.78	3.67	4.00	3.67	3.67	3.78	4.56	3.78	4.22	4.22	4.56	4.00	4.22
	5723	Al Hamando, Mazin	5	20.0%	1.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.40	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
	3503	Brown, David	9	88.9%	3.88	3.50	3.88	4.13	3.38	3.50	3.71	4.13	3.50	3.88	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.79

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course						The Instructor							
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
	5803	Fawcett, David	10	80.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.25	4.38	4.48	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.71
	1074	Kana, Ayman	21	38.1%	4.63	4.38	4.75	4.50	4.63	4.63	4.58	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.75
	1074	Michaels, James	23	39.1%	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.56	4.56	4.57	4.67	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.76
	1074	Zendeli, Bashkim	39	87.2%	4.24	4.26	4.18	3.88	4.00	3.97	4.09	4.50	4.12	4.12	4.21	4.18	4.12	4.21
MET	6243	Lowry, Pamela	2	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
MGT	2113	Fadel-Bazzi, Nadia	17	64.7%	4.73	4.64	4.73	4.73	4.55	4.64	4.67	4.73	4.64	4.82	4.73	4.64	4.64	4.70
	2203	Stavros, Jacqueline	28	50.0%	5.00	5.00	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.86	4.90	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3033	Browne, Warren	17	70.6%	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.58	4.42	4.47	4.92	4.58	4.83	4.83	4.75	4.75	4.78
	3103	Drommi, Antonio	10	40.0%	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.50	3.75	3.75	3.96	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.58
	3113	Raghavan, Srikant	21	76.2%	4.50	4.44	4.63	4.38	4.53	4.44	4.48	4.63	4.56	4.50	4.56	4.60	4.56	4.56
	4213	Zhu, Jianjun	8	87.5%	4.29	4.14	4.43	4.57	4.29	4.57	4.38	4.43	4.43	4.57	4.43	4.71	4.29	4.48
	4023	Omrani, Massood	25	56.0%	4.29	4.21	4.21	4.00	4.14	4.21	4.18	4.43	4.50	4.50	4.36	4.43	4.50	4.45
MKT	2013	Verma, Swati	21	90.5%	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.26	3.95	4.16	4.20	4.37	3.95	4.26	4.26	4.16	4.21	4.20
	3063	McCrorry, Derine	12	50.0%	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.83	4.33	4.67	4.78	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.83	4.92
MSE	5183	Mynderse, James	14	57.1%	4.75	4.63	4.75	4.63	4.63	4.75	4.69	4.75	4.75	4.88	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.77
PHY	1154	Bozin, Keith	14	71.4%	3.40	3.00	3.60	3.40	3.30	3.20	3.32	3.70	3.00	2.90	3.40	3.70	3.30	3.33
	1154	Kuziak, William	12	50.0%	3.50	3.83	4.50	4.17	3.67	3.33	3.83	3.67	3.50	4.00	3.83	3.67	3.33	3.67
	1213	Schneider, Scott	23	87.0%	4.65	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.75	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.75	4.70	4.72
	1221	Schneider, Scott	18	94.4%	4.47	4.53	4.59	4.53	4.24	4.29	4.44	4.59	4.59	4.53	4.53	4.59	4.47	4.55
	2213	Abro, Sabah	14	14.3%	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50	3.00	4.00	4.08	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.42
	2213	Ghoddoussi, Farhad	20	55.0%	4.55	4.00	4.27	4.18	4.27	4.18	4.29	4.45	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.18	4.18	4.23
	2213	Kana, Ayman	14	28.6%	5.00	4.25	5.00	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.67	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.75	5.00	4.75	4.88
	2213	Rands, Marilyn	18	94.4%	4.41	4.59	4.59	4.47	4.18	4.18	4.40	4.82	4.53	4.71	4.65	4.76	4.53	4.67
	2221	Beck, Samuel	20	40.0%	3.75	4.00	3.75	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.87	4.00	4.00	4.13	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.02
	2221	Bozin, Keith	9	66.7%	4.17	4.17	4.00	4.00	4.17	3.50	4.00	3.83	4.00	3.83	4.17	4.33	4.17	4.06
	2221	Ghoddoussi, Farhad	6	66.7%	4.75	4.25	4.25	4.25	3.50	3.50	4.08	4.25	4.25	3.00	4.50	4.25	4.00	4.04
	2221	Thapa, Ranjeeta	3	100.0%	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.06	3.67	2.67	3.33	3.67	3.00	3.67	3.33
	2221	Wickramarachchi, Samantha	5	40.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.92	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.83
	2221	Zhou, Changgong	7	85.7%	3.50	3.50	3.17	3.50	3.17	3.33	3.36	3.67	3.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.83	3.81
	2223	Pokharel, Rajendra	20	90.0%	3.72	3.61	3.83	3.78	3.61	3.50	3.68	4.33	3.44	3.83	3.94	3.94	3.50	3.83
	2223	Rands, Marilyn	19	84.2%	4.38	4.38	4.56	4.56	4.19	4.31	4.40	4.63	4.38	4.50	4.44	4.56	4.44	4.49
	2223	Thapa, Ranjeeta	8	62.5%	4.60	3.80	3.80	3.60	3.40	3.80	3.83	4.60	3.00	3.20	3.20	3.80	2.40	3.37
	2231	Farhat, Hussein	15	73.3%	4.36	3.82	4.09	4.00	3.45	3.73	3.91	4.45	4.09	4.00	3.91	4.27	3.91	4.11
	2231	Wickramarachchi, Samantha	29	75.9%	4.00	3.95	4.09	3.86	3.77	3.82	3.92	4.14	3.95	3.95	4.05	4.14	3.86	3.99
	2413	Ahmadi, Parviz	15	66.7%	4.30	4.71	4.60	3.89	4.30	4.10	4.25	4.70	4.20	4.11	4.10	4.50	4.30	4.32
	2413	Pokharel, Rajendra	7	85.7%	3.83	3.83	4.00	4.17	3.50	3.83	3.86	4.17	3.50	4.00	3.83	4.33	3.83	3.94
	2413	Schneider, Scott	19	94.7%	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.78	4.61	4.67	4.69	4.89	4.78	4.78	4.72	4.78	4.89	4.81
	2413	Tobos, Valentina	35	65.7%	4.35	4.17	4.30	4.48	4.09	4.09	4.25	4.48	4.22	4.43	4.43	4.35	4.22	4.36
	2421	Beck, Samuel	10	70.0%	3.86	4.14	3.86	4.00	3.86	3.71	3.90	4.14	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.17	4.00	4.12
	2421	Bozin, Keith	14	57.1%	3.75	3.50	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.63	3.69	3.88	3.63	4.00	3.88	3.75	3.63	3.79
	2421	Ghoddoussi, Farhad	9	33.3%	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	3.67	3.67	4.28	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.56
	2421	Thapa, Ranjeeta	15	60.0%	3.78	4.00	3.67	3.78	3.67	3.78	3.78	3.56	3.56	3.89	3.67	3.22	3.44	3.56
	2421	Wickramarachchi, Samantha	12	75.0%	4.44	4.25	4.44	4.44	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.89	4.22	4.56	4.33	4.22	4.26
	2421	Zhou, Changgong	25	64.0%	3.69	4.13	4.19	3.81	3.94	3.75	3.92	4.44	3.94	4.19	4.25	3.94	4.06	4.14
	2423	Moschelli, George	15	60.0%	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.56	3.89	4.44	4.43	4.89	4.78	4.56	4.44	4.89	4.78	4.72

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
PHY	2423	Pokharel, Rajendra	36	94.4%	4.18	4.00	4.12	4.18	4.00	3.91	4.06	4.38	3.56	4.21	3.91	4.50	3.91	4.08
	2423	Tobos, Valentina	24	50.0%	4.08	4.00	4.08	4.00	4.08	4.08	4.06	4.42	4.08	4.17	4.08	4.33	4.17	4.21
	2431	Chamlagain, Bhim	48	77.1%	3.46	3.68	3.68	3.57	3.43	3.51	3.55	3.78	2.73	2.97	3.31	3.22	3.11	3.16
	2431	Ghoddoussi, Farhad	17	47.1%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.25	4.00	4.10	4.50	4.63	4.75	4.63	4.86	4.63	4.65
	2431	Thapa, Ranjeeta	17	76.5%	3.31	3.31	3.38	3.92	3.38	3.46	3.46	3.15	2.92	3.54	3.85	3.77	3.08	3.38
	3653	Schneider, Scott	7	85.7%	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.72	4.83	4.83	5.00	4.83	5.00	4.83	4.89
	4743	Zhou, Changgong	4	75.0%	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	2221/2421	Beck, Samuel	7	100.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.86	4.00	3.71	3.93	3.43	3.43	4.00	3.71	3.14	3.43	3.52
	3661	Zhou, Changgong	4	75.0%	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.56	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
	4781	Zhou, Changgong	4	75.0%	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.56	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67
4763	Moschelli, George	2	50.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
PSC	1161	Moschelli, George	5	60.0%	4.00	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.54	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.61
	3223	Nasir, Mansoor	4	75.0%	3.67	4.00	3.67	3.33	3.33	3.67	3.61	4.00	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.72
	1131	Thomas, David	7	42.9%	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.44	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.61
PSY	1213	Delogu, Franco	20	60.0%	3.58	3.58	4.25	4.08	3.92	3.67	3.85	4.83	3.92	4.42	4.25	4.67	4.25	4.39
	1213	Molloy, Sara	18	66.7%	4.33	4.25	4.17	4.33	4.08	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.42	4.50	4.33	4.33	4.17	4.35
	1213	Watson, Donna	18	66.7%	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.33	3.82	4.00	4.13	4.67	4.50	4.00	4.25	4.08	3.91	4.23
	2113	Delogu, Franco	8	37.5%	3.33	4.00	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.00	3.83	4.33	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	4.11
	2613	Morgan-Paisley, Kineta	11	36.4%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	5.00	4.96	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	3213	Delogu, Franco	7	71.4%	4.20	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.40	4.40	4.33	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.57
	3213	Sirabonian, Mgrdich	7	57.1%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.54
	3323	Molloy, Sara	19	57.9%	4.27	4.36	4.36	4.09	4.09	4.18	4.23	4.09	4.27	4.18	4.27	4.27	4.55	4.27
	3623	Morgan-Paisley, Kineta	20	75.0%	4.40	4.33	4.40	4.53	4.40	4.47	4.42	4.53	4.47	4.43	4.60	4.47	4.53	4.51
	4633	Sirabonian, Mgrdich	11	63.6%	4.57	4.43	4.57	4.57	4.43	4.29	4.48	4.43	4.57	4.43	4.43	4.57	4.43	4.48
	4912	Delogu, Franco	2	50.0%	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
	3713	Morgan-Paisley, Kineta	19	68.4%	4.46	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.38	4.46	4.44	4.54	4.46	4.54	4.46	4.46	4.46	4.49
SSC	2303	Gadd, Kenneth	11	9.1%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	2303	Mulder, Daniel	45	55.6%	4.24	4.40	4.32	4.44	4.16	4.32	4.31	4.68	4.16	4.04	4.40	4.48	4.24	4.33
	2413	Barrett, Jason	19	36.8%	3.71	4.14	4.14	3.43	3.57	3.57	3.76	4.86	4.43	4.71	4.57	4.86	4.71	4.69
	2413	Powell, Jeffrey	20	70.0%	4.43	4.43	4.43	4.07	4.14	4.29	4.30	4.86	4.64	4.50	4.29	4.64	4.71	4.61
	2413	Shargel, Daniel	40	55.0%	4.00	4.23	4.27	3.82	3.86	3.77	3.99	4.36	4.18	4.45	4.18	4.41	4.18	4.30
	2413	Sledge, James	42	71.4%	4.63	4.73	4.57	4.60	4.63	4.60	4.63	4.73	4.60	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.68
	2413	Stern, Marvin	40	42.5%	3.06	3.71	2.94	2.88	2.82	3.24	3.11	3.53	2.82	2.76	2.82	3.41	3.12	3.08
	2413	Vogt, Philip	52	63.5%	4.09	4.24	4.12	3.82	4.00	3.70	3.99	4.61	4.09	3.70	3.59	4.06	3.58	3.94
	2423	Dettmar, Benjamin	39	56.4%	4.27	4.23	4.14	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.77	4.68	4.43	4.45	4.68	4.55	4.59
	2423	Evans, Karen	13	46.2%	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.17	4.00	4.17	4.17	4.17	4.00	4.11
	2423	Powell, Jeffrey	28	57.1%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.63	4.44	4.52	4.88	4.69	4.44	4.44	4.75	4.63	4.64
	2423	Stern, Marvin	32	46.9%	2.36	3.07	2.62	2.36	2.36	2.29	2.49	3.36	2.07	2.43	2.21	3.36	2.43	2.64
	2423	Wilhelm, Stephanie	19	57.9%	4.18	4.18	4.45	4.27	4.00	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.27	4.09	4.36	4.00	4.00	4.17
	3513	Kler, Marlene	19	42.1%	4.75	4.63	4.75	4.63	4.63	4.50	4.65	4.75	4.63	4.75	4.88	4.88	4.75	4.77
	3523	Kler, Marlene	21	52.4%	4.00	4.27	3.91	4.18	3.64	3.91	3.98	4.18	4.00	4.27	4.36	4.36	4.00	4.20
	3723	Sledge, James	21	81.0%	4.59	4.53	4.59	4.47	4.59	4.65	4.57	4.88	4.76	4.71	4.71	4.88	4.88	4.80
	6013	Shamir, Mirit	9	66.7%	4.83	4.83	4.50	4.83	4.33	4.50	4.64	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.67	4.69
	3713	Shargel, Daniel	19	78.9%	4.27	4.33	4.27	4.07	4.00	3.93	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.47	4.20	4.53	4.13	4.31
	3253	Vogt, Philip	7	42.9%	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	3.67	4.06	5.00	4.00	3.33	3.67	3.67	3.33	3.83
	TAS	1013	Nelson, Robert	12	58.3%	4.00	3.86	4.29	4.00	3.86	4.00	4.00	4.29	3.86	4.14	4.14	4.57	4.29
3013		Blau, Ben	8	75.0%	4.33	4.17	4.33	4.00	4.50	4.33	4.28	4.50	4.67	4.83	4.33	4.50	4.50	4.56

Fall 2016 Student Course Evaluation Results
Sorted by Course

Responses scored on Likert scale of: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, and a No Opinion choice available.

			Participation		The Course							The Instructor						
Subject Code	Course Number	Instructor Name	Class Size	Response Rate	The course was well structured with clear objectives and requirements.	The course materials (texts, audio/visual, supplemental materials) were appropriately chosen and useful relative to the course objectives.	The course assignments (homework, projects, tests and quizzes) were relevant based upon the course objectives, materials, and lectures.	The course had clear grading criteria supported by course objectives and content.	The pace, content, and design of the course challenged me to do my best work.	Overall, the course was effective.	Course Average	The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the course content.	The instructor clearly and effectively communicated course content and requirements.	The instructor addressed students' concerns professionally, respectfully and in a timely manner.	The instructor clearly communicated and impartially applied grading criteria.	The instructor was enthusiastic about the course content and working with students.	Overall, the instructor was effective.	Instructor Average
TAS	3033	Blau, Ben	17	64.7%	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.45	4.45	4.37	4.73	4.45	4.18	4.36	4.55	4.45	4.45
	4133	Giese, Dieter	8	62.5%	4.40	4.60	4.40	4.40	4.40	4.60	4.47	4.80	4.60	4.60	4.60	5.00	4.60	4.70
	3034	Giese, Dieter	9	88.9%	4.50	4.25	4.63	4.38	4.38	4.63	4.46	4.75	4.63	4.63	4.63	4.88	4.63	4.69
TCE	2073	Lamus, Christopher	8	62.5%	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.67	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80
	2143	Hammond, Jason	11	45.5%	4.80	4.60	4.80	4.00	4.20	4.40	4.47	5.00	4.60	4.80	4.60	5.00	5.00	4.83
	3053	Ward, Matthew	4	50.0%	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	4093	Jones-Williams, Tawanesha	9	66.7%	4.33	4.50	4.83	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.53	4.67	4.83	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.75
	4113	Hammond, Jason	8	100.0%	4.75	4.88	4.88	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.79	5.00	4.75	4.75	4.88	5.00	5.00	4.90
	4213	Jones-Williams, Tawanesha	5	60.0%	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.56
TEE	2033	Sacchetti, David	7	57.1%	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.67	4.67	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	2093	Schlick, William	5	80.0%	3.75	3.75	3.50	3.75	3.50	3.75	3.67	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.75	4.25	4.38
	3103	Cook, Kenneth	12	91.7%	5.00	4.91	4.91	4.82	5.00	5.00	4.94	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	4224	Sacchetti, David	13	84.6%	4.82	4.73	4.82	4.91	4.82	4.91	4.83	4.82	4.82	4.82	4.82	4.80	4.82	4.81
TIE	2093	Cuper, Jerry	6	83.3%	4.20	4.40	4.60	4.20	4.00	4.20	4.27	4.00	4.40	4.40	4.20	4.20	4.40	4.27
	3063	Shamamy, Patricia	16	50.0%	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.38	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.63	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.60
	3163	Abro, Sabah	26	96.2%	4.28	4.36	4.32	4.20	4.04	3.88	4.18	4.52	4.28	4.40	4.28	4.48	4.20	4.36
	3203	Shamamy, Patricia	33	69.7%	4.61	4.48	4.57	4.52	4.48	4.57	4.54	4.65	4.61	4.65	4.70	4.74	4.61	4.66
	4115	Cook, Kenneth	13	69.2%	4.75	4.88	4.78	4.78	4.88	4.89	4.83	4.78	4.89	4.67	4.78	4.78	4.67	4.76
	5343	Abro, Sabah	10	90.0%	4.78	4.56	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.78	4.70	5.00	4.78	4.89	5.00	4.89	4.89	4.91
TME	1023	Cuper, Jerry	23	69.6%	4.69	4.63	4.69	4.63	4.50	4.69	4.64	4.75	4.63	4.69	4.81	4.81	4.88	4.76
	3113	Hermez, Munther	21	85.7%	3.72	3.94	4.11	3.94	3.78	3.56	3.84	3.94	3.56	3.61	3.78	3.94	3.39	3.70
	3333	Abro, Sabah	28	89.3%	4.32	4.32	4.48	4.44	4.36	4.28	4.37	4.64	4.40	4.52	4.56	4.52	4.44	4.51
	4103	Shamamy, Patricia	27	63.0%	4.65	4.65	4.76	4.76	4.59	4.65	4.68	4.76	4.82	4.76	4.82	4.76	4.82	4.79
	4113	Sepulveda, Roland	15	80.0%	4.75	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.75	4.75	4.75	4.83	4.58	4.75	4.75	4.74
	4413	Cuper, Jerry	14	100.0%	4.64	4.57	4.71	4.64	4.57	4.64	4.63	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.79	4.71	4.73
	5123	Cook, Kenneth	7	100.0%	4.71	4.71	4.86	4.71	4.57	4.86	4.74	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Total/Average			12,623	66.0%	4.25	4.25	4.30	4.22	4.18	4.17	4.23	4.48	4.26	4.36	4.31	4.40	4.31	4.35