

Course-Section: ENCH 215 0101
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING ANALY
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 698
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	1	0	2	6	18	4.48	639/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	17	4.44	673/1674	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	5	15	4.31	803/1423	4.31	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	1	7	7	5	3.55	1435/1609	3.55	4.23	4.22	4.23	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	3	7	12	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	4	1	2	5	8	3.60	1240/1535	3.60	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	10	13	4.26	866/1651	4.26	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	522/1656	4.40	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	371/1586	4.81	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	227/1585	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	496/1582	4.63	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	18	4.48	717/1575	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	4	4	4	4	3.35	1118/1380	3.35	3.94	3.94	4.03	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	8	6	4	4	3	2.52	1469/1520	2.52	4.14	4.01	4.03	2.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	8	2	5	4	2.65	1466/1515	2.65	4.37	4.24	4.28	2.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	6	7	4	3.08	1408/1511	3.08	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	18	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	959/ 994	2.57	3.97	3.94	3.98	2.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 28 Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENCH 215H 0101
 Title CHEM ENGR ANALYSIS-HON
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 699
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	438/1582	4.83	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1520	1.00	4.14	4.01	4.03	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1510/1515	1.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	1.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1495/1511	2.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENCH 215H 0101
 Title CHEM ENGR ANALYSIS-HON
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 700
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	771/1423	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.10	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	4.83	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.39	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1520	1.00	4.14	4.01	4.03	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1510/1515	1.50	4.37	4.24	4.28	1.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1495/1511	2.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 300 0101
 Title CHEM PROC THERMODYNAMIC
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 701
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	7	7	8	4.05	1163/1674	4.05	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	4	8	3.73	1388/1674	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.21	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	11	7	3.95	1061/1423	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.27	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	6	7	3.82	1278/1609	3.82	4.23	4.22	4.27	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	6	6	5	3.55	1193/1585	3.55	4.04	3.96	3.95	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	9	6	3.68	1196/1535	3.68	4.08	4.08	4.15	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	6	3	11	3.95	1162/1651	3.95	4.20	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	14	2	3.82	1192/1656	3.82	4.06	4.07	4.07	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.42	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	762/1585	4.82	4.72	4.69	4.66	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	4	7	4	3.76	1296/1582	3.76	4.30	4.26	4.26	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1322/1575	3.69	4.32	4.27	4.25	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	13	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1010/1520	3.78	4.14	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1145/1515	3.89	4.37	4.24	4.32	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1150/1511	3.89	4.37	4.27	4.34	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	657/ 994	3.71	3.97	3.94	3.96	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		21
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 425 0101
 Title TRANSPORT I:FLUIDS
 Instructor: ROSS, JULIA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 702
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	5	22	4.69	380/1674	4.69	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	433/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	431/1423	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	5	6	14	4.36	701/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	6	10	8	3.78	1032/1585	3.78	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	5	4	13	4.26	655/1535	4.26	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	484/1651	4.54	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	548/1656	4.38	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	301/1586	4.86	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	1002/1585	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	423/1582	4.68	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	23	4.71	423/1575	4.71	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	14	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	709/1520	4.18	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	798/1515	4.36	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	186/ 994	4.56	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 2
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 6	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENCH 437L 0101
 Title CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L
 Instructor: PULSIFER, ALLEN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 703
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	7	4.70	367/1674	4.70	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	413/1585	4.40	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	215/1535	4.70	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	615/1656	4.33	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	784/1586	4.57	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1040/1575	4.17	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1380	****	3.94	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.45	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 265	5.00	4.06	4.23	4.53	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 278	5.00	4.21	4.19	4.21	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.43	4.46	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	104/ 259	4.60	4.21	4.33	4.31	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	61/ 233	4.60	4.36	4.20	4.10	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 444 0101
 Title PROCESS ENGINEERING EC
 Instructor: KELLER, DAVID G
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 704
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	6	12	4.67	406/1674	4.67	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	153/1674	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	322/1423	4.71	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	432/1609	4.56	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	3	4	2	3	3.23	1372/1585	3.23	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	454/1535	4.44	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	220/1651	4.76	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1442/1673	4.22	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	331/1656	4.57	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	354/1586	4.82	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1585	4.94	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	447/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 445 0101
 Title SEPARATION PROCESSES
 Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 705
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	671/1674	4.46	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	446/1674	4.62	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	105/1423	4.92	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	892/1609	4.22	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1385/1585	3.20	4.04	3.96	4.01	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	703/1535	4.22	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	700/1651	4.38	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1040/1673	4.69	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1124/1656	3.91	4.06	4.07	4.19	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	319/1586	4.85	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1035/1585	4.69	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	882/1582	4.31	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	565/1575	4.62	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	200/1380	4.67	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1520	****	4.14	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1515	****	4.37	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1511	****	4.37	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.24	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.31	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.36	4.20	4.10	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENCH 445 0101
 Title SEPARATION PROCESSES
 Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 705
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 482 0101
 Title BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERIN
 Instructor: MARTEN, MARK
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 706
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	768/1674	4.40	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	379/1674	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/1423	4.93	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	963/1609	4.17	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	612/1585	4.20	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	558/1535	4.36	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1182/1673	4.53	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	849/1656	4.14	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	826/1586	4.53	4.43	4.43	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	397/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	867/1575	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	887/1380	3.78	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	162/1520	4.86	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	165/1515	4.93	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	195/1511	4.93	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	10	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	638/ 994	3.75	3.97	3.94	4.19	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0101
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO
 Instructor: MOREIRA, ANTONI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 707
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	5	1	3.86	1353/1674	3.95	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1590/1674	3.72	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1266/1609	4.61	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1256/1535	2.52	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	524/1651	3.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	3.67	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1162/1656	2.46	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1002/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	903/1582	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1240/1575	3.96	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	426/1380	4.07	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	960/1515	4.06	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	955/1511	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	56/ 103	4.50	4.39	4.41	4.56	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0101
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 708
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	5	1	3.86	1353/1674	3.95	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1590/1674	3.72	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1016/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1266/1609	4.61	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1256/1535	2.52	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	524/1651	3.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	3.67	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1656	2.46	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1575	3.96	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	4.07	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1353/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	960/1515	4.06	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	955/1511	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	56/ 103	4.50	4.39	4.41	4.56	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0301
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO
 Instructor: MOREIRA, ANTONI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 709
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4.00	1196/1674	3.95	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	3.72	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.61	4.23	4.22	4.34	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	2.52	4.08	4.08	4.27	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.67	4.65	4.69	4.78	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1641/1656	2.46	4.06	4.07	4.15	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1575	3.96	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.07	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.06	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0301
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 710
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4.00	1196/1674	3.95	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	3.72	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.61	4.23	4.22	4.34	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	2.52	4.08	4.08	4.27	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.67	4.65	4.69	4.78	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1641/1656	2.46	4.06	4.07	4.15	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1585	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1575	3.96	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.07	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.06	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0301
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 711
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4.00	1196/1674	3.95	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	3.72	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.61	4.23	4.22	4.34	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	2.52	4.08	4.08	4.27	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.67	4.65	4.69	4.78	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1641/1656	2.46	4.06	4.07	4.15	2.00	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.07	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.06	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0301
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 712
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	0	4.00	1196/1674	3.95	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	3.72	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1423	4.67	4.36	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	4.61	4.23	4.22	4.34	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1535	2.52	4.08	4.08	4.27	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1562/1651	3.50	4.20	4.18	4.32	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1663/1673	3.67	4.65	4.69	4.78	3.00	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.07	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.33	4.14	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.06	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.07	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	881/ 994	3.00	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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