```
Course Section: ENCH 215  0101              University of Maryland
Title          CHEM ENGINEERING ANALY       Baltimore County
Instructor:    BAYLES, TARYN                 Fall  2006
Enrollment:       33
Questionnaires:   21                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	1	17	4.57	511/1669	4.57	4.42	4.23	4.34	4.57
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.30	4.19	4.29	4.67
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	657/1421	4.43	4.30	4.24	4.35	4.43
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	887/1617	4.18	4.19	4.15	4.24	4.18
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	8	8	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.96	4.00
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1068/1543	3.85	4.04	4.06	4.10	3.85
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.33
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.94	4.67	4.59	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	10	7	4.16	800/1605	4.16	4.28	4.07	4.15	4.16
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	715/1514	4.57	4.25	4.39	4.39	4.57
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.55	4.66	4.72	4.86
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	969/1503	4.15	4.09	4.24	4.29	4.15
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	838/1506	4.33	4.25	4.26	4.33	4.33
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	209/1311	4.63	3.70	3.85	3.96	4.63
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	4	4	2	3	2.88	1386/1490	2.88	3.18	4.05	4.11	2.88
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	1	5	1	5	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	3.32	4.26	4.31	3.00
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	1	4	2	7	3.69	1218/1489	3.69	4.02	4.29	4.36	3.69
4.	Were special techniques successful	5	13	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1006	****	3.35	4.00	3.99	****
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.86	4.20	4.42	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.75	4.19	4.36	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.86	4.50	4.74	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.75	4.35	4.71	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.63	4.15	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

```
Course Section: ENCH 215H 0101                    University of Maryland                        Page  670
Title           CHEM ENGR ANALYSIS-HON             Baltimore County                             JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:     BAYLES, TARYN                      Fall   2006                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     3
Questionnaires: 3                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                     Frequencies       Instructor    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  0  3  5.00    1/1669    5.00  4.42  4.23  4.34  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1666    5.00  4.30  4.19  4.29  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  392/1421    4.67  4.30  4.24  4.35  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  323/1617    4.67  4.19  4.15  4.24  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1133/1555    3.67  3.95  4.00  3.96  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  895/1543    4.00  4.04  4.06  4.10  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1647    5.00  4.33  4.12  4.19  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1668    5.00  4.94  4.67  4.59  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1605    5.00  4.28  4.07  4.15  5.00

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  584/1514    4.67  4.25  4.39  4.39  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1551    5.00  4.55  4.66  4.72  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  386/1503    4.67  4.09  4.24  4.29  4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1506    5.00  4.25  4.26  4.33  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0  0  1  1  0  3.50  939/1311    3.50  3.70  3.85  3.96  3.50

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  0  0  0  0  1.00 1490/1490    1.00  3.18  4.05  4.11  1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 1501/1502    1.00  3.32  4.26  4.31  1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 1038/1489    4.00  4.02  4.29  4.36  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course Section: ENCH 300  0101              University of Maryland                           Page  671
Title      CHEM PROC THERMODYNAMI           Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  CASTELLANOS, MA                Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    42
Questionnaires:  30                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor   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   2   5  10  13   4.13 1064/1669  4.13  4.42  4.23  4.28  4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   2   2   8  12   6   3.60 1432/1666  3.60  4.30  4.19  4.20  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   3   4  11   8   4   3.20 1319/1421  3.20  4.30  4.24  4.25  3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   4  11   9   5   3.43 1409/1617  3.43  4.19  4.15  4.22  3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   2   2   7  10   8   3.69 1118/1555  3.69  3.95  4.00  4.03  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  3   6   9   9   3   3.10 1393/1543  3.10  4.04  4.06  4.14  3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   2   9   7  10   3.70 1300/1647  3.70  4.33  4.12  4.14  3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1   0   0   1   1  27   4.90  731/1668  4.90  4.94  4.67  4.68  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   1   4  12  13   4.23  713/1605  4.23  4.28  4.07  4.09  4.23

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   1   1   6  11  10   3.97 1227/1514  3.97  4.25  4.39  4.46  3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   1   0   3   6  19   4.45 1239/1551  4.45  4.55  4.66  4.70  4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   3   1  10   9   6   3.48 1337/1503  3.48  4.09  4.24  4.28  3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   3   3   7   9   7   3.48 1324/1506  3.48  4.25  4.26  4.30  3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 8  4   1   9   4   0   2.72 1201/1311  2.72  3.70  3.85  3.97  2.72

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24 0  2   0   2   2   0   2.67 ****/1490  ****  3.18  4.05  4.11  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24 0  0   1   1   3   1   3.67 ****/1502  ****  3.32  4.26  4.28  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 24 0 0   1   2   2   1   3.50 ****/1489  ****  4.02  4.29  4.35  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  23   2   0   1   2   1   1   3.40 ****/1006  ****  3.35  4.00  4.10  ****
```

```
                                    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    2        Major      22
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B   13
 56-83     6        2.00-2.99   5       C    5        General              1      Under-grad  28       Non-major   8
 84-150    5        3.00-3.49   5       D    1
 Grad.     2        3.50-4.00   8       F    0        Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other               23
                                        ?    1
```

```
Enrollment:     40
Questionnaires: 31                              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                        Frequencies        Instructor    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  1  1 10 19  4.52  578/1669   4.52  4.42  4.23  4.39  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  6 11 14  4.26  881/1666   4.26  4.30  4.19  4.22  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  4 12 14  4.26  814/1421   4.26  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  2  3 11 12  4.18  887/1617   4.18  4.19  4.15  4.22  4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  1  8 15  6  3.77 1045/1555   3.77  3.95  4.00  4.08  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 12 0 1  5  7  6  3.95  969/1543   3.95  4.04  4.06  4.18  3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  3 11 17  4.45  566/1647   4.45  4.33  4.12  4.14  4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  9 22  4.71 1030/1668   4.71  4.94  4.67  4.70  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 0 0 0  3 13  6  4.14  820/1605   4.14  4.28  4.07  4.16  4.14

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  2  6 21  1  3.70 1341/1514   3.70  4.25  4.39  4.45  3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0 12 18  4.60 1111/1551   4.60  4.55  4.66  4.73  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  3  7 16  4  3.70 1261/1503   3.70  4.09  4.24  4.27  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  2  1  9 18  4.43  731/1506   4.43  4.25  4.26  4.29  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15 4  3  3  5  0  2.60 1213/1311   2.60  3.70  3.85  3.88  2.60

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 24  0  1  0  5  0  1  3.00 ****/1490   ****  3.18  4.05  4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 24  0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14 ****/1502   ****  3.32  4.26  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 25 0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50 ****/1489   ****  4.02  4.29  4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  24   5  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/1006   ****  3.35  4.00  4.21  ****

                 Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  29   1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 226   ****  4.86  4.20  4.61  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 233   ****  4.75  4.19  4.40  ****
```

```
                                              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        27
28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0        B   17
56-83      6        2.00-2.99    4        C    4       General              0      Under-grad   31      Non-major     4
84-150    10        3.00-3.49    9        D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    6        F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other               28
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course Section: ENCH 437L 0101          University of Maryland                              Page  673
Title       CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L       Baltimore County                                 JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   PULSIFER, ALLEN            Fall  2006                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      10
Questionnaires: 10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies       Instructor    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  3  7  4.70  345/1669  4.70  4.42  4.23  4.39  4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  319/1666  4.70  4.30  4.19  4.22  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  280/1421  4.75  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  161/1617  4.80  4.19  4.15  4.22  4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  225/1555  4.67  3.95  4.00  4.08  4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  0  0  1  8  4.89  111/1543  4.89  4.04  4.06  4.18  4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  123/1647  4.89  4.33  4.12  4.14  4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.94  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1605  5.00  4.28  4.07  4.16  5.00

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  441/1514  4.75  4.25  4.39  4.45  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40 1270/1551  4.40  4.55  4.66  4.73  4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  277/1503  4.75  4.09  4.24  4.27  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  353/1506  4.75  4.25  4.26  4.29  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 1 0 0  0  1  3  4.75  142/1311  4.75  3.70  3.85  3.88  4.75

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1490  ****  3.18  4.05  4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1502  ****  3.32  4.26  4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1489  ****  4.02  4.29  4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  ****/1006  ****  3.35  4.00  4.21  ****

                Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2   1  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   33/ 226  4.86  4.86  4.20  4.61  4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 0  0  2  6  4.75   51/ 233  4.75  4.75  4.19  4.40  4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 0  0  0  1  6  4.86   64/ 225  4.86  4.86  4.50  4.39  4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           2   0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75   69/ 223  4.75  4.75  4.35  4.56  4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63   60/ 206  4.63  4.63  4.15  4.20  4.63

                Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 112  ****  ****  4.38  4.74  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  97  ****  ****  4.36  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/  92  ****  ****  4.22  4.48  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8   0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/ 105  ****  ****  4.20  4.27  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  98  ****  ****  3.95  3.86  ****

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  58  ****  ****  4.22  3.94  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  3.80  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  39  ****  ****  4.39  3.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  40  ****  ****  3.97  3.81  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  30  ****  ****  4.33  4.50  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  55  ****  ****  4.34  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  42  ****  ****  4.31  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  46  ****  ****  4.45  4.92  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  33  ****  ****  4.25  3.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     9   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  29  ****  ****  4.34  2.00  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

```
Course Section: ENCH 444  0101                University of Maryland                              Page  674
Title       PROCESS ENGINEERING EC               Baltimore County                               JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   LEACH, TOM                              Fall  2006                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      19
Questionnaires:  17                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                    Frequencies        Instructor    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  2  3  8  4  3.82 1339/1669  3.82 4.42  4.23 4.39  3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  5  6  5  3.88 1250/1666  3.88 4.30  4.19 4.22  3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   6  0  0  1  6  4  4.27  797/1421  4.27 4.30  4.24 4.38  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1  8  7  4.24  821/1617  4.24 4.19  4.15 4.22  4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2   4  0  2  4  4  1  3.36 1316/1555  3.36 3.95  4.00 4.08  3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  2  0  2  2  5  4  3.85 1068/1543  3.85 4.04  4.06 4.18  3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0  2  2  4  2  5  3.40 1440/1647  3.40 4.33  4.12 4.14  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                   2   0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  499/1668  4.93 4.94  4.67 4.70  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  1  8  6  2  3.53 1348/1605  3.53 4.28  4.07 4.16  3.53


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  2  6  4  5  3.71 1341/1514  3.71 4.25  4.39 4.45  3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  5  8  4  3.94 1427/1551  3.94 4.55  4.66 4.73  3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  6  7  3  3.65 1285/1503  3.65 4.09  4.24 4.27  3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  2  6  5  4  3.65 1284/1506  3.65 4.25  4.26 4.29  3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  8  2  0  3  2  1  3.00 1115/1311  3.00 3.70  3.85 3.88  3.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75 ****/1490  **** 3.18  4.05 4.26  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/1502  **** 3.32  4.26 4.46  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50 ****/1489  **** 4.02  4.29 4.52  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   13  1  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1006  **** 3.35  4.00 4.21  ****

             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 112  **** ****  4.38 4.74  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                     Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1       0.00-0.99   0      A   15         Required for Majors  0      Graduate    0       Major        15
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99   0      B    0                                                         
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99   1      C    0         General              0      Under-grad  17      Non-major     2
 84-150     5       3.00-3.49   5      D    0                                                         
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   2      F    0         Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                          responses to be significant
                                       I    0         Other                17
                                       ?    2
```

```
Course Section: ENCH 445  0101            University of Maryland                            Page  675
Title      SEPARATION PROCESSES               Baltimore County                           JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:   FREY, DOUGLAS                      Fall   2006                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  19                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies       Instructor    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  8 11  4.58  511/1669  4.58  4.42  4.23  4.39  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  6 11  4.47  591/1666  4.47  4.30  4.19  4.22  4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  5 14  4.74  305/1421  4.74  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   7  0  1  1  6  4  4.08  981/1617  4.08  4.19  4.15  4.22  4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  0  0  6  4  3  3.77 1054/1555  3.77  3.95  4.00  4.08  3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 8 0 1 0 1 7  4.56  344/1543  4.56  4.04  4.06  4.18  4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  2  2  5 10  4.21  907/1647  4.21  4.33  4.12  4.14  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.94  4.67  4.70  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 3 8 8  4.26  678/1605  4.26  4.28  4.07  4.16  4.26

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  2  2 15  4.68  553/1514  4.68  4.25  4.39  4.45  4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  6 13  4.68 1000/1551  4.68  4.55  4.66  4.73  4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  3  6 10  4.37  765/1503  4.37  4.09  4.24  4.27  4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  1  0  8 10  4.42  744/1506  4.42  4.25  4.26  4.29  4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 6 0 2 1 1 8  4.25  445/1311  4.25  3.70  3.85  3.88  4.25

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1  4  4.80  214/1490  4.80  3.18  4.05  4.26  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0 1 1  3  4.40  754/1502  4.40  3.32  4.26  4.46  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 0 1 1 3  4.40  800/1489  4.40  4.02  4.29  4.52  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  14   2  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/1006  ****  3.35  4.00  4.21  ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99    0       A    7     Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0     Major       15
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0       B    6
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0       C    0     General              0    Under-grad   19     Non-major    4
  84-150    5      3.00-3.49    6       D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    4       F    0     Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                              responses to be significant
                                        I    0     Other               18
                                        ?    3
```

```
Course Section: ENCH 482  0101            University of Maryland                      Page  676
Title      BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERIN            Baltimore County                        JAN 18, 2007
Instructor:  MARTEN, MARK                      Fall  2006                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    19
Questionnaires:  15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   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  1  3 11  4.67  389/1669  4.67  4.42  4.23  4.39  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  439/1666  4.60  4.30  4.19  4.22  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  6  7  4.43  657/1421  4.43  4.30  4.24  4.38  4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  1  1  0  4  3  6  3.93 1140/1617  3.93  4.19  4.15  4.22  3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60  262/1555  4.60  3.95  4.00  4.08  4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3  0  1  3  1  7  4.17  759/1543  4.17  4.04  4.06  4.18  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  4  3  8  4.27  851/1647  4.27  4.33  4.12  4.14  4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  570/1668  4.93  4.94  4.67  4.70  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67  239/1605  4.67  4.28  4.07  4.16  4.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  4 11  4.73  473/1514  4.73  4.25  4.39  4.45  4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0 15  5.00    1/1551  5.00  4.55  4.66  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  528/1503  4.54  4.09  4.24  4.27  4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71  407/1506  4.71  4.25  4.26  4.29  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 2  1  0  4  3  5  3.85  738/1311  3.85  3.70  3.85  3.88  3.85


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  400/1490  4.58  3.18  4.05  4.26  4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  296/1502  4.85  3.32  4.26  4.46  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  0  4  9  4.69  500/1489  4.69  4.02  4.29  4.52  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  8  0  0  2  0  3  4.20  407/1006  4.20  3.35  4.00  4.21  4.20


                               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      3     Major      14
 28-55      0     1.00-1.99    0        B    5
 56-83      0     2.00-2.99    0        C    0     General              5     Under-grad   12     Non-major   1
 84-150     3     3.00-3.49    6        D    0
 Grad.      3     3.50-4.00    3        F    0     Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                responses to be significant
                                       I    0     Other               10
                                       ?    1
```

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 5   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                          Frequencies       Instructor   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    1   0   0  0  1  3  0  3.75 1371/1669  3.75  4.42  4.23  4.35  3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1466/1666  3.50  4.30  4.19  4.19  3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0  0  1  2  1  4.00  969/1421  4.00  4.30  4.24  4.33  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   2   0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/1617  ****  4.19  4.15  4.24  ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2   0  0  0  2  0  4.00  773/1555  4.00  3.95  4.00  4.07  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0   0  0  1  1  1  4.00  895/1543  4.00  4.04  4.06  4.27  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0  0  0  1  3  4.75  213/1647  4.75  4.33  4.12  4.15  4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1668  5.00  4.94  4.67  4.83  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   0  0  2  2  0  3.50 1357/1605  3.50  4.28  4.07  4.13  3.50

                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0  1  1  1  1  3.50 1389/1514  3.50  4.25  4.39  4.37  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0  0  1  2  1  4.00 1404/1551  4.00  4.55  4.66  4.72  4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1330/1503  3.50  4.09  4.24  4.22  3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0  0  3  0  1  3.50 1319/1506  3.50  4.25  4.26  4.24  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  0   0  0  1  2  1  4.00  587/1311  4.00  3.70  3.85  3.89  4.00

                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0   0  1  2  0  0  2.67 1417/1490  2.67  3.18  4.05  4.18  2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   1  0  0  1  1  3.33 1357/1502  3.33  3.32  4.26  4.46  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   1  0  0  1  1  3.33 1341/1489  3.33  4.02  4.29  4.44  3.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1   1  0  0  1  0  2.50  967/1006  2.50  3.35  4.00  4.11  2.50
```

Frequency Distribution

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