University of Maryland Course-Section: ENCE 612 01 Title Environ Physicochem Pr

Baltimore County

Instructor: Reed, Brian E

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 4

JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 576

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	2	2	0	3.50	1339/1447	3.50	4.08	4.31	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1215/1241	3.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1392/1402	2.50	4.11	4.24	4.29	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1251/1358	3.25	3.85	4.11	4.26	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1257/1316	3.00	4.10	4.14	4.34	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1164/1427	3.75	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1419/1447	3.75	4.43	4.69	4.74	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1389/1434	2.75	3.65	4.10	4.21	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.95	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	Λ	1	1	1	1	3.50	999/1172	3.50	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	0	1		1121/1182	3.25	4.04	4.35	4.46	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	0	0		1163/1170	2.50	3.58	4.38	4.52	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	795/ 800	2.00	2.00	4.06	4.10	2.00
1. Hold apoolal occurryach haccopplat	J	5	J	_	J	J	J	2.00	.55, 500	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.10	2.00

## Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	rades Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	3	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	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 658 01 University of Maryland Title Modeling/Urban Envir Baltimore County Instructor: Swan, Christophe (Instr. A) Spring 2010

University of Maryland Page 577
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7					
Questionnaires:	7	S	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	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.0
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.5
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.0
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.2
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.0
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.1
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.8
3. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.7
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	849/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.8
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.5
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.8
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	719/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.2
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	739/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.2
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	867/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.6
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.6
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	4.0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	4.0
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	2.00	4.06	4.10	***
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCE 658 01 University of Maryland Page 578
Title Modeling/Urban Envir Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Farrow, Robert S (Instr. B) Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7			
Questionnaires:	7	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	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 fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instruct	J ,		0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.57
3. Did the exam que			0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned rea	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.14
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained -	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.86
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.71
9. How would you gr	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1031/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.88
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instruct	or seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.82
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	855/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	971/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	867/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.68
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all student	s actively encourage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instruct			4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	-	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	2.00	4.06	4.10	****
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	oe			Majors	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	4	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	7	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				2	0							

Course-Section: ENCE 658 01 University of Maryland Title Modeling/Urban Envir Instructor: Neerchal, Nagara (Instr. C)

Page 579 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7	
0	_	

BIII OI IIIICIIC •	,			
Questionnaires:	7	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	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1		1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0		- ,	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1238/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1105/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1243/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	936/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1		856/1182		4.04	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1		864/1170		3.58	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 800		2.00	4.06	4.10	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
				_					_					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	Graduate 4		0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	3	Non-major	7	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>				
				P	0							
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				2	0							

Course-Section: ENCE 658 01 University of Maryl
Title Modeling/Urban Envir Baltimore County
Instructor: Welty, Claire (Instr. D) Spring 2010

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Page 580
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	7	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnaires.	1	Scudenc	Course	Evaluation	Quescronnarre

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions				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	2	2	2	4 00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.00
	. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1		1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.57
2	. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.00
4	. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.29
5		0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.00
6		0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.14
7	. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2		1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.86
8	3 3 1 1 1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.71
	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	733/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.88
	. now would you grade one everall beauting errectiveness	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	ŭ		_		, 55, 1151	3.00	3.05	1.10		3.00
	Lecture														
1	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.50
2	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.82
3	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	539/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.21
4	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.29
5	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	867/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.68
	Discussion														
1	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.67
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	4.00
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	4.00
	. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	U	0		****/ 800	****	2.00	4.06	4.10	****
4	. Were special techniques successful	4	2	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 800		2.00	4.00	4.10	
	Frequ	.ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
С	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Тут	oe			Majors	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	6	 Graduate	4	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	3	Non-major	7	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	0					
				2	Λ							

Course-Section: ENCE 701 01

Title Spec Topics Enviro Eng

Instructor: Welty, Claire

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 581 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies				ructor		Dept	-	Level				
		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	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	5.00
		ctor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	3.80	4.27	4.30	5.00
		uations reflect the e		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.11	4.24	4.29	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.10	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.03	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.00
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.54	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.36	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	3.95	4.02	4.02	5.00
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.69	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively encourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1137/1170	3.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	3.00
		Laboratory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequate bac	kground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.79	5.00
		Seminar															
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute to wha	t you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.64	5.00
		Self Paced															
1. Did sel	lf-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.85	5.00
2. Did stu	udy quest	tions make clear the	expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.65	5.00
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Туј	pe			Majors	ı
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	 A 0								1			·	Mo i c		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	A 0 B 0		Red	4ulr.	eu I	or Ma	a jor:	5	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)T	0
20-55	U	1.00-1.55	D U														

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27 1		1 0.00-0.99 0		 А	0	Required for Majors	1	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	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0					
				2	Λ							