

Course-Section: ENCH 215 1
 Title Chem Engineering Analy
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 595
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	8	30	4.63	446/1509	4.63	4.52	4.31	4.34	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	10	24	4.34	763/1509	4.34	4.31	4.26	4.32	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	4	12	22	4.27	771/1287	4.27	4.31	4.30	4.35	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	0	1	5	14	13	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.31	4.22	4.30	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	2	3	11	21	4.38	470/1406	4.38	3.97	4.09	4.09	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	2	1	8	14	7	3.72	1076/1384	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.09	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	7	16	16	4.10	923/1489	4.10	4.24	4.17	4.19	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	26	4.63	965/1506	4.63	4.42	4.67	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	0	6	9	16	4.32	556/1463	4.32	4.20	4.09	4.08	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	14	21	4.34	991/1438	4.34	4.61	4.46	4.48	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	38	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.85	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	14	18	4.20	936/1411	4.20	4.41	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	10	24	4.41	745/1405	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.39	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	3	1	5	6	6	3.52	974/1236	3.52	4.06	4.00	4.11	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	5	13	12	4.13	701/1260	4.13	4.05	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	5	8	9	8	3.58	1108/1255	3.58	4.32	4.33	4.37	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	2	12	11	4.15	878/1258	4.15	4.39	4.38	4.44	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	14	23	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 873	****	3.50	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.91	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	****	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	****	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: ENCH 215 1
 Title Chem Engineering Analy
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 595
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	39
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENCH 300 1
 Title Chem Proc Thermodynami
 Instructor: Good,Theresa
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 596
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	15	20	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.52	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	19	8	3.94	1132/1509	3.94	4.31	4.26	4.25	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	9	15	9	3.89	1031/1287	3.89	4.31	4.30	4.33	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	938/1459	4.06	4.31	4.22	4.26	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	2	6	10	8	3.92	909/1406	3.92	3.97	4.09	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	1	1	2	6	11	4.19	677/1384	4.19	4.19	4.11	4.15	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	11	16	4.09	930/1489	4.09	4.24	4.17	4.14	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	9	20	4	3.71	1473/1506	3.71	4.42	4.67	4.67	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	11	15	4	3.77	1092/1463	3.77	4.20	4.09	4.08	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	11	16	7	3.80	1297/1438	3.80	4.61	4.46	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	10	23	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.85	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	15	13	3	3.40	1309/1411	3.40	4.41	4.31	4.29	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	7	19	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	28	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1236	****	4.06	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	4	8	7	3	3.21	1133/1260	3.21	4.05	4.14	4.22	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	10	8	3	3.42	1151/1255	3.42	4.32	4.33	4.37	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	3	8	8	4	3.46	1156/1258	3.46	4.39	4.38	4.42	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	11	19	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	3.50	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.91	4.22	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 33	Graduate 0 Major 29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 35 Non-major 6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 425 1
 Title Transport I:Fluids
 Instructor: Ross,Julia M
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 597
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	8	30	4.66	422/1509	4.66	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	33	4.76	256/1509	4.76	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	16	22	4.46	566/1287	4.46	4.31	4.30	4.38	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	5	13	14	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	4	7	14	9	3.67	1105/1406	3.67	3.97	4.09	4.11	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	2	2	12	17	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	30	4.68	254/1489	4.68	4.24	4.17	4.18	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	22	4.54	1046/1506	4.54	4.42	4.67	4.67	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	10	24	4.57	278/1463	4.57	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	175/1438	4.93	4.61	4.46	4.50	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	35	4.85	665/1421	4.85	4.85	4.73	4.76	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	9	28	4.63	469/1411	4.63	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	33	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	27	2	1	3	2	5	3.54	969/1236	3.54	4.06	4.00	4.03	3.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	36
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	6
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 437L 1
 Title Chemical Engineering L
 Instructor: Leach,Jennie B
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 598
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	648/1509	4.47	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.31	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	400/1406	4.44	3.97	4.09	4.11	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	165/1384	4.73	4.19	4.11	4.23	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	341/1489	4.60	4.24	4.17	4.18	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.42	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	164/1463	4.73	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.61	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.85	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	889/1405	4.27	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1260	****	4.05	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1255	****	4.32	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1258	****	4.39	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.50	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	23/ 184	4.82	4.82	4.16	4.62	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	20/ 198	4.91	4.91	4.22	4.37	4.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	87/ 184	4.64	4.64	4.48	4.66	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	34/ 177	4.82	4.82	4.36	4.47	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	14/ 165	4.91	4.91	4.18	4.29	4.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0
				P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other	0
				? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 444 1
 Title Process Engineering Ec
 Instructor: Tourgee, Dan
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 599
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	711/1509	4.42	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	9	4.04	1056/1509	4.04	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1287	****	4.31	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	378/1459	4.58	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	4	6	5	3	3.15	1309/1406	3.15	3.97	4.09	4.11	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	912/1384	3.93	4.19	4.11	4.23	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	6	14	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	18	4	4.08	1353/1506	4.08	4.42	4.67	4.67	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	11	2	3.94	944/1463	3.94	4.20	4.09	4.18	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	1032/1438	4.30	4.61	4.46	4.50	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	828/1421	4.78	4.85	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	701/1411	4.43	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	7	1	15	4.35	818/1405	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	536/1236	4.20	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1260	****	4.05	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1255	****	4.32	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	****	4.39	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.50	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.82	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.91	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.64	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.82	4.36	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENCH 445 1
 Title Separation Processes
 Instructor: Frey, Douglas
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 600
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	363/1509	4.71	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	378/1509	4.65	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	191/1287	4.82	4.31	4.30	4.38	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	247/1459	4.70	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1237/1406	3.40	3.97	4.09	4.11	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	440/1384	4.40	4.19	4.11	4.23	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	364/1489	4.59	4.24	4.17	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1194/1506	4.35	4.42	4.67	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	523/1463	4.35	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	131/1438	4.94	4.61	4.46	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.85	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	469/1411	4.63	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	486/1405	4.65	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	96/1236	4.82	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1260	****	4.05	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1255	****	4.32	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	****	4.39	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.50	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENCH 482 1
 Title Biochemical Engineerin
 Instructor: Marten,Mark R
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 601
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	756/1509	4.38	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1509	4.63	4.31	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.31	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.97	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.19	4.11	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1335/1506	4.13	4.42	4.67	4.67	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.61	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.85	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.05	4.14	4.25	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.32	4.33	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.39	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.50	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 610 1
 Title Chem. Eng. Thermodynam
 Instructor: Loehe, Joseph R
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 602
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	998/1509	4.14	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.31	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1127/1459	3.86	4.31	4.22	4.16	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	551/1406	4.29	3.97	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1159/1384	3.57	4.19	4.11	4.16	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.24	4.17	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.42	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1207/1463	3.60	4.20	4.09	4.15	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.61	4.46	4.49	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.85	4.73	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1288/1405	3.43	4.40	4.32	4.33	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1031/1236	3.40	4.06	4.00	3.98	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.05	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.32	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.39	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.50	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 682 1
 Title Biochemical Engineerin
 Instructor: Marten,Mark R
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 603
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.52	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1259/1509	3.75	4.31	4.26	4.25	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.31	4.30	4.22	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1192/1459	3.75	4.31	4.22	4.16	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.97	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.19	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1197/1489	3.75	4.24	4.17	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	845/1506	4.75	4.42	4.67	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.20	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.61	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.85	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.06	4.00	3.98	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.05	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.32	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.39	4.38	4.50	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	3.50	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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