| | | | 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	1	3	4	30	4.66	446/1649	4.66	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	10	23	4.42	672/1648	4.42	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	25	4.42	641/1375	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.37	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	709/1595	4.34	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	12	20	4.44	432/1533	4.44	4.01	4.04	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	6	8	15	4.31	616/1512	4.31	4.15	4.10	4.14	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	7	24	4.42	608/1623	4.42	3.98	4.16	4.21	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	199/1646	4.97	4.66	4.69	4.63	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	185/1621	4.72	4.15	4.06	4.01	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	9	24	4.54	803/1568	4.54	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	12	23	4.51	640/1564	4.51	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	8	28	4.68	499/1559	4.68	4.23	4.29	4.33	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	3	3	2	8	3.61	996/1352	3.61	3.99	3.98	4.07	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	4	7	5	11	3.57	1055/1384	3.57	3.35	4.08	3.99	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	8	10	11	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.96	4.29	4.19	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	9	4	14	3.97	981/1368	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.21	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	10	16	3	1	5	1	3	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	2.17	3.95	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.70	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.90	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 212	****	4.80	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.70	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	****/ 288	****	3.60	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	2	0	2	0	10	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.68	3.68	3.59	3.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: ENCH 215H 0101             University of Maryland                            Page  675
Title      CHEM ENGR ANALYSIS-HON          Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   BAYLES, TARYN                Fall   2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
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  0  1  3  4.75  328/1649  4.75  4.43  4.28  4.29  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  263/1648  4.75  4.20  4.23  4.25  4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  296/1375  4.75  4.27  4.27  4.37  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25  818/1595  4.25  4.16  4.20  4.22  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  0  1  2  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.01  4.04  4.04  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0  1  2  0  1  3.25 1375/1512  3.25  4.15  4.10  4.14  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  2  0  2  4.00 1029/1623  4.00  3.98  4.16  4.21  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.66  4.69  4.63  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  0  3  1  4.25  687/1621  4.25  4.15  4.06  4.01  4.25


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  1  1  2  4.25 1121/1568  4.25  4.50  4.43  4.39  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.82  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  2  2  4.50  651/1564  4.50  4.32  4.28  4.27  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  1  0  3  4.50  695/1559  4.50  4.23  4.29  4.33  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/1352  ****  3.99  3.98  4.07  ****


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  0  1  0  0  1.67 1375/1384  1.67  3.35  4.08  3.99  1.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  0  0  1  1  3.33 1251/1382  3.33  3.96  4.29  4.19  3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 2  0  0  0  1  2.33 1351/1368  2.33  3.91  4.30  4.21  2.33

            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 2  0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33   58/ 288  4.33  3.60  3.68  3.65  4.33

            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  3  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00   68/ 312  4.00  3.68  3.68  3.59  4.00

                                      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     0       Major       4
 28-55     1      1.00-1.99    0       B    1                                                      
 56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0       C    1      General               0    Under-grad   5       Non-major   1
 84-150    1      3.00-3.49    0       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                 4
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 300  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 676
Title        CHEM PROC THERMODYNAMI            Baltimore County                                      FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  CASTELLANOS, MA                  Fall  2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 25                     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   1   1   6   7  10  3.96 1218/1649  3.96  4.43  4.28  4.27  3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   1   2   8   7   7  3.68 1395/1648  3.68  4.20  4.23  4.18  3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0   1   4   5   9   6  3.60 1169/1375  3.60  4.27  4.27  4.22  3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   2   1   6   8   8  3.76 1280/1595  3.76  4.16  4.20  4.21  3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   1   3   0   6   3  12  3.88  945/1533  3.88  4.01  4.04  4.05  3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   4   3   6   6   6  3.28 1363/1512  3.28  4.15  4.10  4.11  3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   5  11   9  4.16  915/1623  4.16  3.98  4.16  4.08  4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88  697/1646  4.88  4.66  4.69  4.67  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  0   1   1   0   9   5   9  3.88 1087/1621  3.88  4.15  4.06  4.02  3.88


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   3   8  12  4.39  992/1568  4.39  4.50  4.43  4.39  4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   2   5  16  4.61 1146/1572  4.61  4.82  4.70  4.64  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2   0   2   3   8   4   6  3.39 1429/1564  3.39  4.32  4.28  4.25  3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0   3   2   4   5   9  3.65 1326/1559  3.65  4.23  4.29  4.23  3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  3  10   2   2   3   4   1  3.00 1219/1352  3.00  3.99  3.98  3.97  3.00


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  5   0   7   3   3   4   3  2.65 1336/1384  2.65  3.35  4.08  4.11  2.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  5   0   3   3   4   5   5  3.30 1259/1382  3.30  3.96  4.29  4.37  3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6   0   5   0   5   5   4  3.16 1274/1368  3.16  3.91  4.30  4.39  3.16
4. Were special techniques successful                 6  12   2   1   2   1   1  2.71  898/ 948  2.71  2.17  3.95  4.00  2.71


             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  22   2   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 221  ****  4.70  4.16  4.07  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  24   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.90  4.12  3.89  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  24   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 212  ****  4.80  4.40  4.21  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          24   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 209  ****  4.70  4.35  4.12  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  23   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29  4.22  ****


             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               18   0   0   3   0   4   0  3.14  224/ 288  3.14  3.60  3.68  3.58  3.14


             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  22   0   0   0   0   3   0  4.00 ****/ 312  ****  3.68  3.68  3.60  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  53  ****  ****  4.30  4.32  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  30  ****  ****  4.16  4.44  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     24   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.43  5.00  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    4      Required for Majors   0      Graduate     1      Major       21
28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    9                                   Under-grad  24      Non-major    4
56-83      2      2.00-2.99    3      C    5      General               0
84-150     6      3.00-3.49    2      D    1                                   #### - Means there are not enough
Grad.      1      3.50-4.00    8      F    0      Electives             1           responses to be significant
                                     P    0
                                     I    0      Other                20
                                     ?    3
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 425  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  677
Title          TRANSPORT I:FLUIDS            Baltimore County                                         FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    ROSS, JULIA                   Fall   2008                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires: 22                           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  0  5  16  4.76  317/1649  4.76  4.43  4.28 4.50  4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  1  5  15  4.67  362/1648  4.67  4.20  4.23 4.36  4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  0  6  15  4.71  347/1375  4.71  4.27  4.27 4.48  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   3  1  1  3  3  10  4.11  996/1595  4.11  4.16  4.20 4.36  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  2  1  2  5  6   5  3.63 1159/1533  3.63  4.01  4.04 4.14  3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 1 2  6  3.83 1068/1512  3.83  4.15  4.10 4.26  3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  7  12  4.48  541/1623  4.48  3.98  4.16 4.27  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 13   8  4.38 1302/1646  4.38  4.66  4.69 4.71  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 8 13  4.62  279/1621  4.62  4.15  4.06 4.24  4.62


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  0  0  2  16  4.89  273/1568  4.89  4.50  4.43 4.54  4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  0  2  16  4.89  640/1572  4.89  4.82  4.70 4.79  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  1  2  14  4.76  326/1564  4.76  4.32  4.28 4.40  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     4   0  0  0  0  2  16  4.89  227/1559  4.89  4.23  4.29 4.41  4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 4 0 0 2 4 6  4.33  457/1352  4.33  3.99  3.98 4.07  4.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67 ****/1384  ****  3.35  4.08 4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 19 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67 ****/1382  ****  3.96  4.29 4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67 ****/1368  ****  3.91  4.30 4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  19  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 948  ****  2.17  3.95 4.31  ****


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14  0  1  0  2  1  4  3.88  434/ 555  3.88  4.33  4.29 4.41  3.88


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16  0  0  2  0  4  0  3.33  208/ 288  3.33  3.60  3.68 3.71  3.33


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  0  0  1  0  4  0  3.60 ****/ 312  ****  3.68  3.68 3.95  ****


                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons               Type                   Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1          0.00-0.99   0      A    9       Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0        Major       17
 28-55     0          1.00-1.99   0      B    7                                                          
 56-83     5          2.00-2.99   4      C    4       General               0     Under-grad  22        Non-major    5
 84-150    4          3.00-3.49   3      D    0                                                          
 Grad.     0          3.50-4.00   8      F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                16
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 437L 0101               University of Maryland                              Page  678
Title      CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L            Baltimore County                                    FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   LEACH, JENNIE                  Fall   2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
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   2   0  0  0  2  4  7 4.38  803/1649  4.38 4.43  4.28 4.50  4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2   0  0  0  1  2 10 4.69  323/1648  4.69 4.20  4.23 4.36  4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2   9  0  0  0  0  4 5.00    1/1375  5.00 4.27  4.27 4.48  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  0  0  4  9 4.69  291/1595  4.69 4.16  4.20 4.36  4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  5  0  0  2  1  5 4.38  505/1533  4.38 4.01  4.04 4.14  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 0 0  5  7 4.58  324/1512  4.58 4.15  4.10 4.26  4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  1  0  0  4  8 4.38  659/1623  4.38 3.98  4.16 4.27  4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   1  0  0  2  7  3 4.08 1513/1646  4.08 4.66  4.69 4.71  4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 3  6  1 3.80 1151/1621  3.80 4.15  4.06 4.24  3.80


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  1  0  2  4  5 4.00 1279/1568  4.00 4.50  4.43 4.54  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  1  1  0 10 4.58 1165/1572  4.58 4.82  4.70 4.79  4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  1  1  5  5 4.17 1028/1564  4.17 4.32  4.28 4.40  4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  2  1  0  4  5 3.75 1277/1559  3.75 4.23  4.29 4.41  3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 1 2  2  3  4 3.58 1011/1352  3.58 3.99  3.98 4.07  3.58


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0  0  2  2 4.50  437/1384  4.50 3.35  4.08 4.35  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0  0  1  3 4.75  394/1382  4.75 3.96  4.29 4.56  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 0 0  1  3 4.75  426/1368  4.75 3.91  4.30 4.58  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   2  1  0  0  0  1 3.00 ****/ 948  **** 2.17  3.95 4.31  ****


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  5   0  0  0  0  3  7 4.70   41/ 221  4.70 4.70  4.16 4.73  4.70
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 0  1  9 4.90   23/ 243  4.90 4.90  4.12 4.61  4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 0  2  8 4.80   50/ 212  4.80 4.80  4.40 4.57  4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           5   0  0  0  1  1  8 4.70   63/ 209  4.70 4.70  4.35 4.63  4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6   0  0  0  0  2  7 4.78  246/ 555  4.78 4.33  4.29 4.41  4.78


            Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               14   0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 ****/ 288  **** 3.60  3.68 3.71  ****


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11  0  0  3  0  1  0 2.50  279/ 312  2.50 3.68  3.68 3.95  2.50

                                     Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1        0.00-0.99   1       A    7        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0      Major       11
  28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0       B    3
  56-83     0        2.00-2.99   1       C    1        General               0     Under-grad   15      Non-major    4
  84-150    7        3.00-3.49   2       D    0
  Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   4       F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                10
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 444  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  679
Title      PROCESS ENGINEERING EC           Baltimore County                                      FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   TOUREE, DAN                   Fall   2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 18                   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   4  14  4.78  306/1649  4.78  4.43  4.28  4.50  4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   4   3  10  4.17  999/1648  4.17  4.20  4.23  4.36  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  14   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/1375  ****  4.27  4.27  4.48  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   1   0   4  12  4.59  405/1595  4.59  4.16  4.20  4.36  4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   6   0   0   1   5   5  4.36  515/1533  4.36  4.01  4.04  4.14  4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  4   0   0   3   2   9  4.43  493/1512  4.43  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   5   2   0   3   3   5  3.69 1303/1623  3.69  3.98  4.16  4.27  3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   9   9  4.50 1193/1646  4.50  4.66  4.69  4.71  4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0   1   0   2   2  11  4.38  547/1621  4.38  4.15  4.06  4.24  4.38


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   1   2   2  12  4.47  891/1568  4.47  4.50  4.43  4.54  4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   1  16  4.94  355/1572  4.94  4.82  4.70  4.79  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   1   1   2  13  4.59  570/1564  4.59  4.32  4.28  4.40  4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   1   1   1  14  4.65  536/1559  4.65  4.23  4.29  4.41  4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2   0   0   1   0  13  4.86  117/1352  4.86  3.99  3.98  4.07  4.86


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/1384  ****  3.35  4.08  4.35  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15  0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/1382  ****  3.96  4.29  4.56  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/1368  ****  3.91  4.30  4.58  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  2.17  3.95  4.31  ****


                Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 15   0   0   0   0   0   3  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29  4.41  ****


                Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16   0   0   1   0   1   0  3.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.60  3.68  3.71  ****


                Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15   0   1   1   0   0   1  2.67 ****/ 312  ****  3.68  3.68  3.95  ****


                Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  4.22  ****

                            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     Graduate     0      Major       17
28-55    0       1.00-1.99    0       B    3                                                    
56-83    0       2.00-2.99    2       C    0      General              0     Under-grad  18      Non-major    1
84-150   7       3.00-3.49    5       D    0                                                    
Grad.    0       3.50-4.00    5       F    0      Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other               16
                                       ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 445  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  680
Title       SEPARATION PROCESSES           Baltimore County                                 FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   FREY, DOUGLAS                    Fall  2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
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    2  0  0  0  2  5 10  4.47  683/1649  4.47  4.43  4.28  4.50  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     2  0  0  0  1  6 10  4.53  533/1648  4.53  4.20  4.23  4.36  4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  334/1375  4.72  4.27  4.27  4.48  4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1  3  0  1  3  5  6  4.07 1032/1595  4.07  4.16  4.20  4.36  4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  7  0  0  3  2  5  4.20  680/1533  4.20  4.01  4.04  4.14  4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 7  0  1  1  2  6  4.30  627/1512  4.30  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1  0  0  0  0  6 12  4.67  321/1623  4.67  3.98  4.16  4.27  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1  0  0  0  0  6 12  4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.66  4.69  4.71  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  2  2  9  6  4.00  914/1621  4.00  4.15  4.06  4.24  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  4 14  4.78  442/1568  4.78  4.50  4.43  4.54  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67 1071/1572  4.67  4.82  4.70  4.79  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2 10  6  4.22  971/1564  4.22  4.32  4.28  4.40  4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  1  2  3 12  4.44  777/1559  4.44  4.23  4.29  4.41  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 5  1  1  2  2  5  3.82  872/1352  3.82  3.99  3.98  4.07  3.82


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  1  0  0  1  3  4.00  795/1384  4.00  3.35  4.08  4.35  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0  0  1  0  2  2  4.00  946/1382  4.00  3.96  4.29  4.56  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  876/1368  4.20  3.91  4.30  4.58  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                   14 4  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  2.17  3.95  4.31  ****


                 Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  18 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29  4.41  ****


                 Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  16 0  0  1  0  2  0  3.33 ****/ 312  ****  3.68  3.68  3.95  ****


                              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      Graduate      0      Major        16
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    6
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    2        C    1       General              0      Under-grad   19      Non-major     3
 84-150    10       3.00-3.49    6        D    0
 Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    5        F    0       Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other               18
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 482  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  681
Title      BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERIN            Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   MARTEN, MARK                      Fall   2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      15
Questionnaires: 13                      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  1  0  1  1 10  4.46  696/1649  4.46  4.43  4.28  4.50  4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  0  1  4  7  4.23  920/1648  4.23  4.20  4.23  4.36  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  1  0  3  8  4.23  823/1375  4.23  4.27  4.27  4.48  4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  1  0  0  2  7  4.40  636/1595  4.40  4.16  4.20  4.36  4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1  1  1  1  2  6  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.01  4.04  4.14  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2  0  0  2  2  7  4.45  451/1512  4.45  4.15  4.10  4.26  4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   1  1  1  1  4  5  3.92 1164/1623  3.92  3.98  4.16  4.27  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1  5  7  4.46 1230/1646  4.46  4.66  4.69  4.71  4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50  374/1621  4.50  4.15  4.06  4.24  4.50

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  2  4  7  4.38 1002/1568  4.38  4.50  4.43  4.54  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.82  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  1  0  1  3  8  4.31  887/1564  4.31  4.32  4.28  4.40  4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  1  0  2  2  8  4.23  980/1559  4.23  4.23  4.29  4.41  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  501/1352  4.27  3.99  3.98  4.07  4.27

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  275/1384  4.73  3.35  4.08  4.35  4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  243/1382  4.91  3.96  4.29  4.56  4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  461/1368  4.73  3.91  4.30  4.58  4.73
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   9  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 948  ****  2.17  3.95  4.31  ****

             Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 288  ****  3.60  3.68  3.71  ****

             Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  10  0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 ****/ 312  ****  3.68  3.68  3.95  ****

                                       Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0      A   6       Required for Majors  1     Graduate     1      Major        11
 28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0      B   4
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99    1      C   0       General              2     Under-grad  12      Non-major     2
 84-150    5       3.00-3.49    5      D   0
 Grad.     1       3.50-4.00    3      F   0       Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I   0       Other                9
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 610  0101                University of Maryland                                      Page  682
Title         CHEM. ENG. THERMODYNAM              Baltimore County                                        FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:   LOEHE, JOSEPH                       Fall   2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       7
Questionnaires:   7                         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  2  4.17 1057/1649  4.17  4.43  4.28  4.46  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1408/1648  3.67  4.20  4.23  4.34  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83 1071/1375  3.83  4.27  4.27  4.44  3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  1  2  0  3  3.83 1242/1595  3.83  4.16  4.20  4.35  3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17  703/1533  4.17  4.01  4.04  4.28  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  380/1512  4.50  4.15  4.10  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  2  0  1  2  1  3.00 1533/1623  3.00  3.98  4.16  4.29  3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1646  5.00  4.66  4.69  4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20  754/1621  4.20  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.20


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  387/1568  4.80  4.50  4.43  4.52  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.82  4.70  4.83  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  3  0  2  3.80 1273/1564  3.80  4.32  4.28  4.41  3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  2  2  1  0  2.80 1513/1559  2.80  4.23  4.29  4.41  2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  2  2  1  0  2.80 1270/1352  2.80  3.99  3.98  4.10  2.80


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  2  1  1  1  3.20 1209/1384  3.20  3.35  4.08  4.30  3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  716/1382  4.40  3.96  4.29  4.52  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  752/1368  4.40  3.91  4.30  4.56  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   3  1  0  0  1  0  2.50  917/ 948  2.50  2.17  3.95  4.03  2.50


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 664  8010              University of Maryland                              Page  683
Title        QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS          Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MOREIRA, ANTONI (Instr. A)      Fall  2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires:  9                      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  4  5  4.56  577/1649  4.56  4.43  4.28  4.46  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  1  0  3  5  4.33  797/1648  4.33  4.20  4.23  4.34  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  733/1375  4.33  4.27  4.27  4.44  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  3  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  722/1595  4.33  4.16  4.20  4.35  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.01  4.04  4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  380/1512  4.50  4.15  4.10  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  1  1  2  5  4.22  849/1623  4.22  3.98  4.16  4.29  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  1  0  0  8  4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.66  4.69  4.81  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  595/1621  4.33  4.15  4.06  4.20  4.33

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  442/1568  4.76  4.50  4.43  4.52  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  894/1572  4.76  4.82  4.70  4.83  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  310/1564  4.76  4.32  4.28  4.41  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  361/1559  4.69  4.23  4.29  4.41  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  423/1352  4.59  3.99  3.98  4.10  4.59

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  1  0  2  2  3.14 1232/1384  3.14  3.35  4.08  4.30  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  0  1  3  2  3.71 1122/1382  3.71  3.96  4.29  4.52  3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86 1051/1368  3.86  3.91  4.30  4.56  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  3  2  1  1  0  0  1.75  942/ 948  1.75  2.17  3.95  4.03  1.75

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.90  4.12  4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  7  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29  4.66  ****

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  8  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  4.51  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  6  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   68/ 312  4.00  3.68  3.68  3.83  4.00

              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.92  ****

                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 664  8010              University of Maryland                               Page  684
Title       QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS           Baltimore County                                   FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                  (Instr. B)           Fall   2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      13
Questionnaires:   9                    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  4  5  4.56  577/1649  4.56  4.43  4.28  4.46  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  3  5  4.33  797/1648  4.33  4.20  4.23  4.34  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  733/1375  4.33  4.27  4.27  4.44  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   3  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  722/1595  4.33  4.16  4.20  4.35  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.01  4.04  4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0 0  1  1  4  4.50  380/1512  4.50  4.15  4.10  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  1  2  5  4.22  849/1623  4.22  3.98  4.16  4.29  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  1  0  0  8  4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.66  4.69  4.81  4.67


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  480/1568  4.76  4.50  4.43  4.52  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  931/1572  4.76  4.82  4.70  4.83  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  342/1564  4.76  4.32  4.28  4.41  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  512/1559  4.69  4.23  4.29  4.41  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  208/1352  4.59  3.99  3.98  4.10  4.59


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  1  0  2  2  3.14 1232/1384  3.14  3.35  4.08  4.30  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  0  1  3  2  3.71 1122/1382  3.71  3.96  4.29  4.52  3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86 1051/1368  3.86  3.91  4.30  4.56  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   3  2  1  1  0  0  1.75  942/ 948  1.75  2.17  3.95  4.03  1.75


            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.90  4.12  4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29  4.66  ****


            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  4.51  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6   0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   68/ 312  4.00  3.68  3.68  3.83  4.00


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.92  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 664  8010              University of Maryland                        Page  685
Title       QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS          Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                 (Instr. C)      Fall  2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires:  9                 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  4  5 4.56  577/1649  4.56  4.43  4.28 4.46  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  0  3  5 4.33  797/1648  4.33  4.20  4.23 4.34  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  4  4 4.33  733/1375  4.33  4.27  4.27 4.44  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  3  0  0  0  4  2 4.33  722/1595  4.33  4.16  4.20 4.35  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  0  0  1  3  1 4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.01  4.04 4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2 0  0  1  1  4 4.50  380/1512  4.50  4.15  4.10 4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  1  2  5 4.22  849/1623  4.22  3.98  4.16 4.29  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  1  0  0  8 4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.66  4.69 4.81  4.67

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  480/1568  4.76  4.50  4.43 4.52  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5  0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  931/1572  4.76  4.82  4.70 4.83  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0  0  0  0  1  3 4.75  342/1564  4.76  4.32  4.28 4.41  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6  0  0  0  0  1  2 4.67  512/1559  4.69  4.23  4.29 4.41  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0  0  0  1  2 4.67  208/1352  4.59  3.99  3.98 4.10  4.59

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0  2  1  0  2  2 3.14 1232/1384  3.14  3.35  4.08 4.30  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0  1  0  1  3  2 3.71 1122/1382  3.71  3.96  4.29 4.52  3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 1  0  1  2  3 3.86 1051/1368  3.86  3.91  4.30 4.56  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  3  2  1  1  0  0 1.75  942/ 948  1.75  2.17  3.95 4.03  1.75

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 0  1  0  1 4.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.90  4.12 4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7  1  0  0  0  0  1 5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29 4.66  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8  0  1  0  0  0  0 1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06 4.51  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6  0  0  0  0  3  0 4.00   68/ 312  4.00  3.68  3.68 3.83  4.00

            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99 3.92  ****

                            Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 664  8010                    University of Maryland                         Page  686
Title         QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS              Baltimore County                              FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:                    (Instr. D)             Fall   2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      13
Questionnaires:   9                        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  4  5  4.56  577/1649  4.56  4.43  4.28  4.46  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  0  1  0  3  5  4.33  797/1648  4.33  4.20  4.23  4.34  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  733/1375  4.33  4.27  4.27  4.44  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  3  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  722/1595  4.33  4.16  4.20  4.35  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  2  0  0  1  3  1  4.00  815/1533  4.00  4.01  4.04  4.28  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  380/1512  4.50  4.15  4.10  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  0  1  1  2  5  4.22  849/1623  4.22  3.98  4.16  4.29  4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  1  0  0  8  4.67 1037/1646  4.67  4.66  4.69  4.81  4.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       5  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  480/1568  4.76  4.50  4.43  4.52  4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  5  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  931/1572  4.76  4.82  4.70  4.83  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  342/1564  4.76  4.32  4.28  4.41  4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    6  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  512/1559  4.69  4.23  4.29  4.41  4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  208/1352  4.59  3.99  3.98  4.10  4.59


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  2  1  0  2  2  3.14 1232/1384  3.14  3.35  4.08  4.30  3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  1  0  1  3  2  3.71 1122/1382  3.71  3.96  4.29  4.52  3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  1  0  1  2  3  3.86 1051/1368  3.86  3.91  4.30  4.56  3.86
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  3  2  1  1  0  0  1.75  942/ 948  1.75  2.17  3.95  4.03  1.75


              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 243  ****  4.90  4.12  4.61  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29  4.66  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.06  4.51  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 6  0  0  0  0  3  0  4.00   68/ 312  4.00  3.68  3.68  3.83  4.00


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.92  ****


                                     Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 686  0101              University of Maryland                               Page  687
Title        SURVEY OF SENS & INSTR           Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  RAO, GOVIND                         Fall  2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     30
Questionnaires: 27                    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   2   5   6   9   5  3.37 1531/1649  3.37  4.43  4.28  4.46  3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   6   6   8   5   2  2.67 1625/1648  2.67  4.20  4.23  4.34  2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6   4   3   8   4   2  2.86 1346/1375  2.86  4.27  4.27  4.44  2.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2   5   4   6   7   2  2.88 1557/1595  2.88  4.16  4.20  4.35  2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  12   3   2   3   4   3  3.13 1411/1533  3.13  4.01  4.04  4.28  3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  6   3   3   6   4   4  3.15 1406/1512  3.15  4.15  4.10  4.35  3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  12   7   3   2   2   1  2.13 1613/1623  2.13  3.98  4.16  4.29  2.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1   9  17  4.59 1112/1646  4.59  4.66  4.69  4.81  4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8  0   3   2   6   8   0  3.00 1504/1621  3.00  4.15  4.06  4.20  3.00


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   1   5   6   6   7  3.52 1456/1568  3.52  4.50  4.43  4.52  3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   1   0   1   0  23  4.76  912/1572  4.76  4.82  4.70  4.83  4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   3   3   9   6   4  3.20 1472/1564  3.20  4.32  4.28  4.41  3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   5   5   8   4   3  2.80 1513/1559  2.80  4.23  4.29  4.41  2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  2   3   2   6   7   3  3.24 1166/1352  3.24  3.99  3.98  4.10  3.24


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21  0   0   1   1   2   2  3.83 ****/1384  ****  3.35  4.08  4.30  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21  0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50 ****/1382  ****  3.96  4.29  4.52  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0   0   0   1   3   2  4.17 ****/1368  ****  3.91  4.30  4.56  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  21   3   0   0   0   1   2  4.67 ****/ 948  ****  2.17  3.95  4.03  ****


              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 21   0   0   1   0   1   4  4.33 ****/ 555  ****  4.33  4.29  4.66  ****


              Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                22   0   0   3   0   2   0  2.80 ****/ 288  ****  3.60  3.68  3.87  ****


              Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19   0   0   3   0   5   0  3.25  247/ 312  3.25  3.68  3.68  3.83  3.25


              Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   0   0   1   0   0   0  2.00 ****/ 110  ****  ****  3.99  3.92  ****

                                      Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades            Reasons              Type                Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1         0.00-0.99    0      A   10      Required for Majors   3      Graduate      9      Major      12
  28-55      0         1.00-1.99    1      B   10
  56-83      0         2.00-2.99    3      C    0      General              10      Under-grad   18      Non-major  15
  84-150    11         3.00-3.49    7      D    1
  Grad.      9         3.50-4.00    4      F    0      Electives             4      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                           I    0      Other                10
                                           ?    5
```