Course-Section: ENCE 489R 0101

ENV RISK ASSESS AND RE

Title Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 7

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 662 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies Ins		Ins	tructor	<u>-</u>	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	ık		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 General																
1 Did vo	u cain n	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3 86	1379/1	1670	3.86	4.69	4.31	4.45	3.86
_	-	ctor make clear the		0	0	1	0	3	1	2		1536/1			4.23	4.27	4.35	3.43
		uestions reflect th		0	0	0	1	1	3	2		1158/1			4.10	4.32	4.48	3.86
	_	uations reflect the		0	0	0	0	5	0	2		1427/1		3.57	3.43	4.24	4.37	3.57
			to what you learned		2	0	0	1	2	2		706/1			4.21	4.24	4.17	4.20
			te to what you learned	0 1	0	0	1	3	2	0						4.12	4.17	3.17
		_	_			0	1		0			1423/1			4.06			
		g system clearly ex		0	1 0	0	0	3 0	-			1460/1			4.24	4.22	4.28	3.50
		was class cancelle		0	0	0	1	1	4 3			1236/1			4.79	4.67		4.43
9. HOW WO	ouia you	grade the overall t	teaching effectiveness	1	U	U	Τ	Τ	3	Τ	3.67	1312/1	L626	3.67	3.78	4.11	4.28	3.67
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures we	ell prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1	L559	4.40	4.67	4.46	4.58	4.40
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intereste	ed in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1	L560	4.60	4.77	4.72	4.80	4.60
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented ar	nd explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1146/1	L549	4.00	4.19	4.31	4.43	4.00
		es contribute to wh		1	0	0	0	2	1			1056/1		4.17	4.88	4.32	4.43	4.17
			ce your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2			894/1			2.55	4.00	4.10	3.80
		1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,									,						
1 5 1		Discussion		-	0	•	•	0	0	•	2 00	1000/1		2 00	4 0 4	4 10	4 20	2 00
			to what you learned	5 5	0	0	0	2	0	0		1260/1			4.04	4.10	4.32	3.00
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	2	0	0		1297/1		3.00	3.89	4.29	4.55	3.00
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	2	0	0		1304/1		3.00	4.11	4.31	4.60	3.00
4. Were s	. Were special techniques successful			5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	904	****	3.50	4.03	4.22	****
		Seminar																
1. Were a	ssigned	topics relevant to	the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	87	****	****	4.65	4.80	****
			individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	79	****	****	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did re	search p	rojects contribute	to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	75	****	****	4.57	4.56	****
	_	ons contribute to w	-	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	79	****	****	4.45	4.53	****
		for grading made cl		6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	80	****	****	3.97	3.67	****
J. WEIE C	ricciia	ior grading made of	red r	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	,	00			3.5,	3.07	
21		Field Work		_	0	0	•	0	0	-	F 00	ale ale ale de l	2.0	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 60	4 50	de de de de
3. Was th	e instru	ctor available for	consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
		Self Pace	ed															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribute	to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	28	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did st	udy ques	tions make clear th	ne expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.67	4.80	****
4. Was th	e feedba	ck/tutoring by prod	ctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
			Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	n										
			11040	zene j	DID	C1 1D	uc10.											
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Rea	asons	3				Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Grad	duat	 e	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 1	Required for Majors										J -				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General					4	Unde	er-a	rad	6	Non-	-major	7		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0	00110141							J-				3 - "			
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					E] 6	ecti <sup>,</sup>	ves				1	####	‡ – t	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ıh
	_		P 0											es to k			_	•
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					0+1	h					2	_ CDF	. 0.10					

Other

2

I

0

Course-Section: ENCE 612 0101 University of Maryland Title

?

0

ENVIRON PHYSICOCHEM PR Baltimore County Spring 2008

Instructor: REED, BRIAN

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 663

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		~																
1 Did 1701	, gain no	Genera w insights,ski		m thia aourao	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.69	4.31	4.46	4.67
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666		4.23	4.27	4.34	5.00
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406		4.10	4.32	4.36	5.00
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615		3.43	4.24	4.33	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,		4.21	4.07	4.20	4.67
	_	_		o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528		4.06	4.12	4.33	5.00
		system clearl			0	0	0	0	2	0	1		1404/1650		4.24	4.22	4.30	3.67
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667		4.79	4.67		5.00
				ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1534/1626		3.78	4.11		3.00
		Lectur	<b>e</b>															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.67	4.46	4.49	5.00	
		tor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560		4.77	4.72	4.81	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	1		1345/1549			4.31	4.37	3.67
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0		5.00	,	5.00	4.88		4.40	5.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.21	5.00
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1378		3.89	4.29	4.42	5.00
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00			4.11	4.31	4.51	5.00
		chniques succe		-	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	5.00
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.82	5.00
2. Did stu	ıdy quest	ions make clea	r the e	expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.60	5.00
		k/tutoring by			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.90	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n									
Crodita Es	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Por	asons				т.	pe			Majors	
	Expected Cum. GFA Expected Grade									, . – – – -							Majois 	, 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	General										_			•
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera.	L				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150 Grad.	2	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1	D 0 F 0	Flogtivo			a				0	#### -	Moana +	horo o	ro not	onomo	rh
Grau.	۷	3.50-4.00	Т	P 0		Electives				U	#### - respons				_	111		
				I 0		Other					3	respons	co LU L	e pran	ııııdı	10		
				T 0		Other						J						

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101 Title Baltimore County MODELING/URBAN ENVIR

University of Maryland Page 664 AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: WELTY, CLAIRE (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 3 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

FIII OT TIMETIC.	5			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Tna	ructor	Course	Dont	TIMDC	Level	Sect			
	Ouestions		NR	NA	1	eque. 2	3	5 4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.69	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1452/1666	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.67
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1512/1615	3.33	3.43	4.24	4.33	3.33
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.21	4.07	4.20	3.50
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.06	4.12	4.33	3.33
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.67
9. How would you gra	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.78	4.11	4.20	4.00	
Lecture																
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.42	4.67	4.46	4.49	4.42
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560		4.77	4.72	4.49	4.75
3. Was lecture mate		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549		4.19	4.72	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546		4.19	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual		-	0	1	1	0	0	1	٥		1269/1323		2.55	4.00	4.03	2.63
5. Did addiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	U	1	1	U	U	Т	U	2.50	1209/1323	2.03	2.55	4.00	4.03	2.03
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	4.04	4.10	4.21	3.33
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1297/1378	3.00	3.89	4.29	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instruct	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.11	4.31	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful				0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	878/ 904	2.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	2.00
	Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra					Re	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0		2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F P	0	Electives	1	#### - Means responses to		are not enough gnificant	
				I ?	0 0	Other	2				

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101 University of Maryland MODELING/URBAN ENVIR Baltimore County

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

3

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion

4. Were special techniques successful

Page 665 AUG 6, 2008 Title Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.69	4.31	4.46	4.67
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1		1452/1666	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.67
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		1057/1406	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.36	4.00
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		1512/1615	3.33	3.43	4.24	4.33	3.33
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0		1285/1566	3.50	4.21	4.07	4.20	3.50
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		1368/1528	3.33	4.06	4.12	4.33	3.33
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2		1135/1650	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.00
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1022/1667	4.67	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.67
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626		3.78	4.11	4.20	4.00
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	Ο	0	3 00	1518/1559	4.42	4.67	4.46	4.49	4.42
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	4.75	4.77	4.72	4.81	4.75
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		1146/1549	4.17	4.19	4.31	4.37	4.17
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.88	4.32	4.40	5.00
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	0		1295/1323	2.63	2.55	4.00	4.03	2.63
٥.	bid additivibual teemingdes emanee your anderstanding		U	U	_	U	U	O	2.00	12/5/1525	2.03	2.33	1.00	1.03	2.03
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	4.04	4.10	4.21	3.33
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1297/1378	3.00	3.89	4.29	4.42	3.00

## Frequency Distribution

1 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1189/1378 3.50 4.11 4.31 4.51 3.50

0 0 1 1 1 0 0 2.00 878/904 2.00 3.50 4.03 4.04 2.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101 University of Maryland MODELING/URBAN ENVIR Baltimore County

Page 666 AUG 6, 2008 Title Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. C)

		 3	
Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1 (7	479/1670	4.67	4.69	4.31	4.46	4.67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	T		4.67						
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	•	0	•	2	0	1		1452/1666	3.67	4.23	4.27	4.34	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Τ.	1	1		1057/1406	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	Τ		1512/1615	3.33	3.43	4.24	4.33	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	Ţ	0	0	0	1	1	0		1285/1566	3.50	4.21	4.07	4.20	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1		1368/1528	3.33	4.06	4.12	4.33	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2		1135/1650	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2		1022/1667	4.67	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.78	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture							_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	5.00	1/1559	4.42	4.67	4.46	4.49	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	4.75	4.77	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		1146/1549	4.17	4.19	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.88	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1295/1323	2.63	2.55	4.00	4.03	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	Λ	1	3 33	1171/1384	3.33	4.04	4.10	4.21	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1		1297/1378	3.00	3.89	4.29	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	1		1189/1378	3.50	4.11	4.31	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	878/ 904	2.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	2.00
4. Were special techniques successiul	U	U	1	Τ	1	U	U	2.00	0/0/ 904	2.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	2.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA						Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į.
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Ω						

University of Maryland MODELING/URBAN ENVIR Baltimore County

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101 Page 667 AUG 6, 2008 Title Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. D)

		,,	
Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	3		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.69	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1		1452/1666		4.23	4.27	4.34	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		1057/1406		4.10	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1512/1615	3.33	3.43	4.24	4.33	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0		1285/1566		4.21	4.07	4.20	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.06	4.12	4.33	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.79	4.67	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.78	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.42	4.67	4.46	4.49	4.42
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	U T		1/1559		4.67	4.46	4.49	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		1146/1549	4.17	4.19	4.72	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546		4.19	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	٥	0	1		4.00	692/1323		2.55	4.00	4.03	2.63
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	092/1323	2.03	2.55	4.00	4.03	2.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1171/1384	3.33	4.04	4.10	4.21	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1297/1378	3.00	3.89	4.29	4.42	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1189/1378	3.50	4.11	4.31	4.51	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful		0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	878/ 904	2.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	2.00
Freq	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: ENCE 701C 0101 University of Maryland Page 668
Title GRADUATE ENVIR SEMINAR Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: WELTY, CLAIRE (Instr. A) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

(	Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
,	Juescionnaires.	±	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

1

					Fre	-	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.46	5.00		
2. Did the instruct	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.34	5.00		
3. Did the exam que	stions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	3.43	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.21	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.06	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	5.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.67	4.46	4.49	5.00
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.19	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.88	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1318/1323	1.00	2.55	4.00	4.03	1.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all student	s actively encourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.89	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instruct	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.51	5.00		
4. Were special tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	5.00		
	Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: ENCE 701C 0101 University of Maryland GRADUATE ENVIR SEMINAR

Page 669 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. B)

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

1

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dep		UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	3.43	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.21	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.06	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.67	4.46	4.49	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.89	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00.07														

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

Course-Section: ENCE 701C 0101 University of Maryland GRADUATE ENVIR SEMINAR

Page 670 Baltimore County Spring 2008 AUG 6, 2008 Title Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment:	1				
Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fr	eaner	ncies	2		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.69	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1565/1615	3.00	3.43	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.21	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did wr	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.06	4.12	4.33	5.00				
7. Was th	7. Was the grading system clearly explained							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.79	4.67	4.74	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.67	4.46	4.49	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.04	4.10	4.21	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	3.89	4.29	4.42	5.00
		_	_	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	•	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.50	4.03	4.04	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0					Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						