Course-Section: ENCH 225 0101

Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING

Instructor: ROSS, JULIA

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22 Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 657 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionr	aire
-------------------------------------	------

University of Maryland

	Questions						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 -															
1 5'1		Genera	_		•	0	•	•	•	-	1 -	4 50	E12/1EE6	4 55	4 40	4 20	4 25	4 50
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	513/1576		4.49	4.30	4.35	4.59
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	215/1576		4.44	4.27	4.32	4.82
	_	uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	203/1342		4.37	4.32	4.41	4.86
		uations reflect			0	0	0	1	1	6		4.50	511/1520	4.56	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.50
	_	-		what you learned	0	1	0	0	8	6	7	3.95	919/1465	3.81	4.06	4.12	4.09	3.95
5. Did writ	ten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	10	4.14	806/1434	4.35	4.30	4.14	4.06	4.14
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	270/1547	4.64	4.20	4.19	4.22	4.73
3. How many	y times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	665/1574	4.75	4.58	4.64	4.62	4.81
9. How woul	ld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	379/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.52
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the	e instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	2	0	0	0	Ω	5	15	4.75	505/1488	4.88	4.58	4.47	4.44	4.75
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	7	13		1065/1493		4.82	4.73	4.75	4.65
	as lecture material presented and explained clearl				2	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	678/1486		4.32	4.32	4.29	4.5
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	194/1489		4.31	4.32	4.31	
	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				2	7	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	834/1277		3.64	4.03	4.01	
o. Dia audi					2	/	U	۷	3	3	5	3.85	834/12//	3.40	3.04	4.03	4.01	3.83
	Discussion																	
				what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	641/1279	4.29	3.95	4.17	4.14	4.29
2. Were all	l studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1270	4.64	4.26	4.35	4.30	4.57
				nd open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	602/1269	4.64	4.10	4.35	4.29	4.57
4. Were spe	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		15	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	270/ 878	4.38	4.18	4.05	3.92	4.43
		Labora	tory															
1. Did the	lab ind	crease understa	nding o	of the material	10	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	102/ 234	4.29	4.53	4.23	4.44	4.42
			_	ground information	10	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	190/ 240	3.54	3.86	4.35	4.47	4.08
				for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	93/ 229	4.73	4.82	4.51	4.65	4.6
		structor provid			10	1	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	158/ 232		4.10	4.29	4.38	4.09
		_		learly specified	10	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	44/ 379		4.32	4.20	4.29	4.7
o. Were reg	1011 CIIICI	its for tab rep	OICB CI	icarry specifica	10	Ü	O	O	O	3		1.75	11/ 3/2	1.10	1.52	1.20	1.25	1.75
ı Did fiol	ld ormon	Field		what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
i. Did liei	id exper	rience concribu	te to v	what you rearmed	21	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 52			4.40	4./4	
	F						trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					Re	anir	ed f	 วะ M	aior	 `s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	22
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		100	-1 a + 1	-u -	J. 1'1	⊥∪ر م	~	J	CLAGUAL	_	5	.10.)	-	22
	12	2.00-2.99	6	C 5		Go	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad ?	22	Non	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gei	пста	_				U	onder-9	rau 2	۷.	11011-	ma JUL	U
						TO 7	ecti <sup>.</sup>					0	инии.	Moona +	homo -			.h
						上10	ectl.	ves				U	#### - :				_	İTT
P 0						<u> </u>	l=				_	. 7	respons	es to D	e sigr	ıııcar	IL	
	I 0					Otl	her				2	1						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: ENCH 225 0201

Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING

Instructor: ROSS, JULIA

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 16

Page 658 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ω	1	6	9	4.50	637/1576	4.55	4.49	4.30	4.35	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	364/1576	4.75	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	233/1342	4.84	4.37	4.32	4.41	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	376/1520	4.56	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1166/1465	3.81	4.06	4.12	4.09	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	353/1434	4.35	4.30	4.14	4.06	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	457/1547	4.64	4.20	4.19	4.22	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	881/1574	4.75	4.58	4.64	4.62	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	892/1554	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.05	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1488	4.88	4.58	4.47	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	947/1493	4.69	4.82	4.73	4.75	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	468/1486	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	500/1489	4.78	4.31	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	1219/1277	3.26	3.64	4.03	4.01	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	Ο	1	5	4.29	641/1279	4.29	3.95	4.17	4.14	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.64	4.26	4.35	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.64	4.10	4.35	4.29	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.38	4.18	4.05	3.92	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	_	1	4.17	144/ 234	4.29	4.53	4.23	4.44	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	234/ 240	3.54	3.86	4.23	4.44	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.73	4.82	4.51	4.47	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	216/ 232	3.65	4.10	4.29	4.38	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	175/ 379	4.48	4.32	4.20	4.29	4.20
From	020	. Dic.	- n i b-	.+ 4 ~-	•									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 427 0101 University of Maryland
Title TRANS PROC II: MASS TRA Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 659

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	_	0	^	0	0	2	1.0	4 06	000/1576	1 00	1 10	4 20	1 10	1 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	203/1576		4.49	4.30	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	.7	14	4.67	392/1576		4.44	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.37	4.32	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	562/1520	4.48	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	6	11	4.19	708/1465	4.19	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	9	4.05	861/1434	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	186/1547	4.81	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1219/1574	4.38	4.58	4.64	4.69	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	149/1488	4.95	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	484/1486	4.65	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	638/1277	4.13	3.64	4.03	4.04	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	7	1	0	2.46	1254/1279	2.46	3.95	4.17	4.31	2.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	5	0	4	1	2	2.58	1246/1270	2.58	4.26	4.35	4.53	2.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	1	3	1	3	3.00	1210/1269	3.00	4.10	4.35	4.55	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum		7	Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-		_	
	2 0										

Course-Section: ENCH 440 0101 University of Maryland Title CHEM ENGINEERING KINET

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 660

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GOOD, THERESA

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	-					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	_	0	^	4	_	10	1 20	000/1576	1 20	4 40	4 20	1 10	1 20
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	б	12	4.36	829/1576		4.49	4.30	4.46	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	Τ	3	8	10	4.23	968/1576	4.23	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	819/1342		4.37	4.32	4.46	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	2	5	6		1041/1520		4.38	4.25	4.38	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	728/1465		4.06	4.12	4.22	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	3	5	6		1057/1434		4.30	4.14	4.30	3.81
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	860/1547	4.24	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	16	5	4.18	1373/1574	4.18	4.58	4.64	4.69	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	838/1554	4.13	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.13
Lecture			_	_										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	10	6		1233/1488	4.00	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	784/1493	4.82	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	10	9	1	3.48	1339/1486	3.48	4.32	4.32	4.41	3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	10	8	4.14	1042/1489	4.14	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.64	4.03	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
	0.1	•	•	_	^	•	-	- 00	**** (1000	ate ate ate ate	2 05	4 1 1	4 21	at at at at
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	Ι		****/1279	****	3.95	4.17	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1270	****	4.26	4.35	4.53	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1269	****	4.10	4.35	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	0
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENCH 441 0101 University of Maryland RXN KINETICS IN BIOENG Baltimore County

Title Spring 2009 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Ctudent	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Page 661 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencie					Tnat	ructor	Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
	0	0	Ο	0	1	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4 50	4 40	4.30	1 10	4.50
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4		,		$4.49 \\ 4.44$	4.30	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576 298/1342	4.83		4.27	4.35 4.46	4.83
	-	0	-	0	-	1	3	4.75	, -		4.37			
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	•	0	•	0	Ţ	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.06	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	924/1547	4.17	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574		4.58	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.64	4.03		4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 234		4.53	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	91/ 240	4.50	3.86	4.35	4.45	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.82	4.51	4.70	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232		4.10	4.29	4.56	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	229/ 379	4.00	4.32	4.20	4.19	4.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: ENCH 442 0101 University of Maryland Title CHEM ENGINEERING SYS A Baltimore County

SMITH, JEFFREY

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 662

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	23	
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					<u>-</u>				tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	485/1576	4.61	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.61
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	313/1576	4.72	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.72
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.37	4.32	4.46	4.67
		uations reflect			0	3	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.60
				what you learned	. 0	4	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1028/1465	3.86	4.06	4.12	4.22	3.86
	_	-		o what you learn		8	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	716/1434	4.22	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.22
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	399/1547	4.61	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.61
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	508/1574		4.58	4.64	4.69	4.89
				hing effectivene	ss 5	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	886/1554		4.15	4.10	4.24	
	-			5														
		Lectur					•								4 = 0			
		uctor's lecture			2		0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.55	5.00
		ctor seem inter			2		0	0	0	1	15	4.94	390/1493	4.94	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.94
				xplained clearly	. 2		0	0	1	5	10	4.56	607/1486		4.32	4.32	4.41	4.56
		es contribute t		-	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	228/1489	4.88	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.88
5. Did au	.diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understandin	.g 3	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	404/1277	4.40	3.64	4.03	4.04	4.40
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	3.95	4.17	4.31	****
				d to participate			0	0	0	0	1		****/1270	****	4.26	4.35	4.53	****
				d open discussion			0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	4.10	4.35	4.55	****
		echniques succe		a open arboaber	17	-	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 878	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****
	F												,					
				Fr	equenc	y Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	les			Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	8
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		 Re	 equir	ed f	or Ma	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		100	-4011	ca I	O1 140	~ ) 🗆	~	ū	Gradat	_	•	11000	-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	c 1		Ge	enera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		30		_				-	011001 9	1		1.011		ŭ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		F.	lecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
craa.	ŭ	3.33 1.00	•	P 0								•	respons				_	
				I 0		Ωŧ	t.her				1	6	TCCCOID	-2 CO L	.c bigi			
				2 0		0.0					_	- ~						
				. 0														

Course-Section: ENCH 446 0101 University of Maryland Title PROC ENGINEERING ECON Baltimore County

CASTELLANOS, MA

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 22

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2009

Page 663 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA		equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	787/1576	4.41	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.41
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	6	7			1082/1576		4.44	4.27	4.35	4.10
		uestions reflec			0	14	0	2	2	3	1		1252/1342		4.37	4.32	4.46	3.38
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	7	12		683/1520		4.38	4.25	4.38	4.41
				what you learned	1	9	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1355/1465	3.17	4.06	4.12	4.22	3.17
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	6	8	4.05	857/1434	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.05
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	4	3	3	6	5	3.24	1416/1547	3.24	4.20	4.19	4.24	3.24
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.58	4.64	4.69	4.33
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.45
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	2	3	5	4	4	3.28	1426/1488	3.28	4.58	4.47	4.55	3.28
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	849/1493	4.79	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.79
				explained clearly	3	0	1	2	5	6			1296/1486		4.32	4.32	4.41	3.63
		es contribute t			3	0	2	5	6	4			1430/1489		4.31	4.32	4.38	2.95
5. Did au	ıdiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	4	3	3	1	3	5	3.27	1104/1277	3.27	3.64	4.03	4.04	3.27
		Discus																
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	4		4.00	,			4.17		
				ed to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2		4.75			4.26	4.35	4.53	4.75
				nd open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	3		4.13			4.10	4.35		4.13
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		15	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.14
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.19	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 8				Red	guir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	20	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11						J						5 -		-
56-83	-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 0			Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	12	Non-	major	2		
84-150			D 0									5				-		
Grad.					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh	
				P 0				es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt							
				I 0		Otl	her				1	.8	_		_			
				? 1	Other 18													

Course-Section: ENCH 450 0101 University of Maryland Title CHEM PROCESS DEVELOPME Baltimore County

RUDESILL, JOHN

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 664

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,skil		thia aourao	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	582/1576	4.55	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.55
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	683/1576	4.45	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.45
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	443/1342	4.64	4.37	4.32	4.46	4.64
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	597/1520	4.45	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.45
				what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	6	3		798/1465	4.10	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.10
	-	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	659/1434	4.27	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.27
		g system clearly			0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64			4.20	4.19	4.24	4.64
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	0	1	10		469/1574		4.58	4.64	4.69	4.91
				ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	742/1554		4.15	4.10		4.22
J. 110W WO	ara you s	jiade che overa.	rr ccaci	ing crecerveness	-	Ü	Ü	O	_	3	5	1.22	, 12, 1331	1.22	1.15	1.10	1.21	1.22
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were th	he instr	actor's lectures	_	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.80
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.80	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.60
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	3	7		461/1489	4.70	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.70
			_	our understanding	1	1	1	1	0	4	3		876/1277		3.64			3.78
		1000	2															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	assions contrib	ite to v	what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	926/1279	3.83	3.95	4.17	4.31	3.83
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courageo	d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.26	4.35	4.53	4.67
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.10	4.35	4.55	4.50
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful	-	5	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	***	4.18	4.05	4.33	***
	_	-																
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	ıtior	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	. — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ijor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	r •	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				4	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					5						
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENCH 459 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County STAT DESIGN EXPERIMENT Instructor:

LOEHE, JOSEPH Spring 2009

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 665

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2		1275/1576	3.83	4.44	4.27	4.35	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	1		1166/1342	3.67	4.37	4.32	4.46	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1400/1520	3.40	4.38	4.25	4.38	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.06	4.12	4.22	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	777/1434	4.17	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1196/1547	3.83	4.20	4.19	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.58	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.15	4.10	4.24	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	Ω	Λ	Λ	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4		1125/1493	4.60	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	1	2		1307/1486	3.60	4.32	4.32	4.41	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	0	2		1392/1489	3.20	4.31	4.32	4.38	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	1	0	0		1272/1277	1.75	3.64	4.03	4.04	
5. Dia addiovidual recimitques cimanee your anderseanding	_	_	-	_	-	Ü	Ü	1.75	12/2/12//	1.75	3.01	1.05	1.01	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	3.95	4.17	4.31	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.26	4.35	4.53	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1269	3.67	4.10	4.35	4.55	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 878	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****

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

Course-Section: ENCH 484 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 666

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	emiei	ncies	=		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	-	Mean	Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	568/1576	4.54	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.37	4.32	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	385/1520	4.62	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	297/1465	4.62	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	625/1434	4.31	4.30	4.14	4.30	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	160/1547	4.85	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1434/1574	4.08	4.58	4.64	4.69	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1046/1554	3.92	4.15	4.10	4.24	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	0	7	4.08	1075/1489	4.08	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	608/1277	4.17	3.64	4.03	4.04	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	3.95	4.17	4.31	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.26	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.10	4.35	4.55	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.18	4.05	4.33	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 485L 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOCHEM ENGINEERING LA Baltimore County

HEM ENGINEERING LA Baltimore County
DOUGLAS Spring 2009

Ρ

0

0

Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 667 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

7

	Ouestions							_	ncies	3			tructor	Course	Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1081/1576	4.11	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.11
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1345/1576	3.67	4.44	4.27	4.35	3.67
3. Did tl	he exam q	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1209/1342	3.50	4.37	4.32	4.46	3.50
4. Did of	ther eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	859/1520	4.25	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.25
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1302/1465	3.38	4.06	4.12	4.22	3.38
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1015/1434	3.89	4.30	4.14	4.30	3.89
7. Was tl	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	3	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1493/1547	2.83	4.20	4.19	4.24	2.83
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1152/1574	4.44	4.58	4.64	4.69	4.44
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	742/1554	4.22	4.15	4.10	4.24	4.22
		Lecture	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.43
2. Did tl	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.71
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.83
4. Did tl	he lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	2	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1270/1489	3.71	4.31	4.32	4.38	3.71
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	585/1277	4.20	3.64	4.03	4.04	4.20
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	3.95	4.17	4.31	4.67
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.26	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did tl	he instru	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1269	3.67	4.10	4.35	4.55	3.67
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.00
		Labora	tory															
1. Did tl	he lab in	crease understa	nding of	f the material	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	4.53	4.23	4.28	****
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequa	te backs	ground information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.86	4.35	4.45	****
				or lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229		4.82	4.51	4.70	****
		structor provid			8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.10	4.29	4.56	****
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 379	****	4.32	4.20	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		 Re	 miir		or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1/6/	dutt.	cu I	OT MC	نادر	ی	J	Graduat	_	J	Ma JC	<i>,</i> _	,
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-	3		-		5 2	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Electives						0	#### -		here a		enoug	jh

Other

Course-Section: ENCH 489R 0101

Title SPEC TOPICS IN ENVR EN

Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 668 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	5			ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.49	4.30	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1040/1576	4.14	4.44	4.27	4.35	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	812/1342	4.29	4.37	4.32	4.46	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.38	4.25	4.38	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.06	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1033/1434	3.86	4.30	4.14	4.30	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	0	3	2		1316/1547	3.57	4.20	4.19	4.24	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	5		832/1574	4.71	4.58	4.64	4.69	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1110/1554	3.83	4.15	4.10	4.24	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1087/1488	4.29	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	986/1493	4.71	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1086/1277	3.33	3.64	4.03	4.04	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	****	3.95	4.17	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1270	****	4.26	4.35	4.53	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1269	****	4.10	4.35	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	***	4.18	4.05	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	***	***	4.01	3.90	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ī
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ENCH 630 0101 University of Maryland Title TRANSPORT PHENOMENA Baltimore County Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

University of Maryland Page 669
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	DValaacion	Queberonnarie

						Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did 110	u gain n	.Genera w insights,skil	=	thia aourao	0	0	0	Ο	2	1	4	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.49	4.30	4.43	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.29	324/1576	4.29	4.49	4.27	4.43	4.29
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.37	4.32	4.38	4.71
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.57
			-	what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.75
	_	-		what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.30	4.14	4.35	4.83
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.57
		was class cance		inea	0	0	0	0	4	3	0		1561/1574	3.43	4.58	4.64	4.75	3.43
				ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554			4.10	4.18	
J. 110W WO	outu you s	grade the overa.	LI CCACI	iiig circciveness	_	O	U	O	O	1	2	1.33	023/1331	1.55	1.15	1.10	1.10	1.33
		Lecture	خ															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.86
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.80	5.00
					0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	596/1486	4.57	4.32	4.32	4.37	4.57
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	1	4	4.29	934/1489	4.29	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.29
			-	our understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	3.64	4.03	4.08	4.00
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to v	what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1146/1279	3.25	3.95	4.17	4.34	3.25
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.26	4.35	4.53	3.75
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage i	air and	d open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	4.10	4.35	4.55	3.50
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful	_	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.18	4.05	4.11	****
				Frequ	lency	/ Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4	Required for Majors						 S	0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2	Required for Majors						,	· ·	Gradac	_	3	11000	, <u> </u>	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Cellerar							-	9-				5	-
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives						0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ıh	
				P 0		210001100							response				_	
				I 0		Other						6	_		3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENCH 640 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV CHEM REACTN KINETI Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: GOOD, THERESA

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 670

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	1					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
General	•	•	_	_	0	-	_	4 00	010/1556	4 00	4 40	4 20	4 42	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	5	4.83	219/1576		4.49	4.30	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4		392/1576	4.67	4.44	4.27	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	899/1342		4.37	4.32	4.38	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.30	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	1		1347/1547	3.50	4.20	4.19	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3		1079/1574		4.58	4.64		4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.47	4.80	5.00
g .	0	0	0	0	2	2	2		1/1493		4.82			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	•	2	_	_		. ,			4.32	4.37 4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.31	4.32		4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	Τ	0	U	2	2	3.80	856/1277	3.80	3.64	4.03	4.08	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	554/1279	4.40	3.95	4.17	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.26	4.35	4.53	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.10	4.35	4.55	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.11	
1. Hold Special Countiques Successful	_	_	Ü	Ü	Ū	_	Ü	1.00	101, 0.0	1.00	1.10	1.05		1.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ī
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 662 8050

Title GMP'S FOR BIOPROCESSES

Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

MOREIRA, ANTONI

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 671 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Ouesti	ons		NR	Frequencies NA 1 2 3 4				5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
1 5			Gene:		+1-1	2	0	0	0	1	_	1.4	4 65	400/1576	4 65	4 40	4 20	4 42	4 65
			n new insights,s tructor make cle			3	0	0	0	T	5 6	14 14	4.65 4.70	429/1576 350/1576	4.65 4.70	4.49	4.30	4.43	4.65 4.70
			m questions refl			3	3	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	227/1342	4.82	4.37	4.32	4.38	4.70
			valuations refle			3	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	218/1520	4.79	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.79
					what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	322/1465	4.58	4.06	4.12	4.25	4.58
					to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	138/1434	4.83	4.30	4.14	4.35	4.83
			ding system clea:		-	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	375/1547	4.63	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.63
8. Ho	ow mai	ny tir	mes was class ca	ncelled		4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.58	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. Ho	OW WO	uld y	ou grade the ove	rall tead	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	298/1554	4.63	4.15	4.10	4.18	4.63
			Lect	ure															
			structor's lectu			3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	149/1488	4.95	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.95
			tructor seem int		<u> </u>	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.80	5.00
					explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	181/1486	4.89	4.32	4.32	4.37	4.89
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Di							0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	236/1277	4.63	3.64	4.03	4.08	4.63
	Discussion																		
					what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	312/1279	4.70	3.95	4.17	4.34	4.70
					ed to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.26	4.35	4.53	4.70
			tructor encourage l techniques suc		nd open discussion	3	0 3	0 1	0 1	1 2	1	18 10	4.85 4.18	332/1269 410/ 878	4.85 4.18	4.10 4.18	4.35	4.55 4.11	4.85 4.18
	•	-	-																
5. We	ere ci	riter:	Semi: ia for grading m		•	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 375	***	****	4.01	4.10	***
														,					
5 Di	id co	nfere	Fielo nces help you ca:	d Work rry out f	ield activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 326	****	****	4 03	4.10	****
J. D.	La col			-	reid decryreres	2.2	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü		_	3.00	, 320			1.05	1.10	
5 Me	ara +1	here 6	Self nough proctors	Paced	he students	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5 00	5 00	4 N.R	A 13	5 00
J. We	516 (1	ilere (	enough procedis	IOI AII (	the students	1,	O	U	U	O	U	U	3.00	1/ 302	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.13	3.00
	Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	1													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades										asons				Тур	pe			Majors	\$
00-2	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 15							quir	ed fo	or Ma	 jor	 s	0	Graduate	 e 1	.0	Majo	 or	0
28-5	55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-						3 -		
56-8		0	2.00-2.99		C 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-gi	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	23
84-1		0	3.00-3.49		D 0								0			,			,
Grad	1.	10	3.50-4.00	10	F 0		EΙ	ecti	ves				0	#### - N					ın
					P 0 I 0		O+1	ner				1	4	response	es co E	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
	2 0 Other									1	. 7								
? 0																			

Course-Section: ENCH 666 8010 University of Maryland Title BIOTECH FAC DESIGN

Baltimore County

Page 672

Enrollment: 14

JUL 2, 2009 Instructor: LUBINIECKI, ANT Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 Ouestionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 243/1576 4.80 4.49 4.30 4.43 4.80 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 4 4.20 996/1576 4.20 4.44 4.27 4.32 4.20 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 835/1342 4.25 4.37 4.32 4.38 4.25 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 2 3 3 4.13 977/1520 4.13 4.38 4.25 4.36 4.13 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 1 1 0 3 4.00 850/1465 4.00 4.06 4.12 4.25 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 398/1434 4.50 4.30 4.14 4.35 4.507. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 527/1547 4.50 4.20 4.19 4.24 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 1/1574 5.00 4.58 4.64 4.75 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 1 3 3 0 3.29 1381/1554 3.29 4.15 4.10 4.18 3.29

#### Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30 1072/1488	4.30	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50 1210/1493	4.50	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00 1101/1486	4.00	4.32	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	2	5	3.80 1236/1489	3.80	4.31	4.32	4.38	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	0	1	2	3	3.22 1114/1277	3.22	3.64	4.03	4.08	3.22

#### Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	0	2	3	3.00 1186/1279	3.00	3.95	4.17	4.34	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89 1231/1270	2.89	4.26	4.35	4.53	2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22 1184/1269	3.22	4.10	4.35	4.55	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 ****/ 878	****	4.18	4.05	4.11	****

# Laboratory

2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/ 240	****	3.86	4.35	4.37	****

#### Seminar 1 Warran and the same and arrange to the amount of theme

i. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	/	4	U	U	U	U		5.00 """/	00			4./2	4.79	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	79	****	****	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	80	****	****	4.61	4.70	****

### Field Work

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 ****/	52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50 ****/	48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
					_						