Course-Section: ENCE 489R 0101 University of Maryland Title ENV RISK ASSESS AND RE

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 652

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

GHOSH, UPAL

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sec														
				_			_		tructor	Course	_	-		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.35	4.30	4.46	3.7
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	3.50	4.27	4.35	3.5
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.46	4.0
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.38	4.0
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	2.80	4.12	4.22	4.0
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	3.90	4.14	4.30	3.5
. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.10	4.19	4.24	4.5
. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.90	4.64	4.69	4.5
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1166/1554	3.75	3.55	4.10	4.24	3.7
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.35	4.47	4.55	4.2
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.40	4.73	4.80	4.5
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.2
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.25	4.32	4.38	4.2
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.0
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1279	****	4.00	4.17	4.31	***
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1270	****	5.00	4.35	4.53	***
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1269	****	5.00	4.35	4.55	***
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	 0

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

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101

University of Maryland MODELING/URBAN ENVIR Baltimore County

Title Instructor: WELTY, CLAIRE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Spring 2009

Page 653 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

				eque	5			tructor	Course	_		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	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1392/1576		3.50	4.27	4.32	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1448/1465	2.50	2.80	4.12	4.25	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	3.90	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.10	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	3.50	3.55	4.10	4.18	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.38	4.35	4.47	4.52	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493		4.40	4.73	4.80	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486		4.05	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.25	4.25	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.25	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.00	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	2.00	4.05	4.11	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234		5.00	4.23	4.36	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232		5.00	4.29	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.37	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 72		5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.70	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.10	5.00
Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3

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

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101

Title MODELING/URBAN ENVIR SWAN, CHRIS

Instructor: Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

(Instr. B)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 654 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

						FΥ	equei	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sec
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean		Mean				
		General															
. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,skill	s from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.5
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1392/1576		3.50	4.27	4.32	3.5
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		583/1342		4.40	4.32	4.38	4.5
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1041/1520		4.00	4.25		4.0
		e to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0		1448/1465		2.80		4.25		
		ute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		878/1434		3.90	4.14	4.35	4.	
	explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1041/1547		4.10	4.19	4.24			
. How many times was class cancelled . How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574		4.90	4.64	4.75	5.
How wou	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	3.55	4.10	4.18	3.			
		Lecture															
		uctor's lectures		0	0	0	1	0	0	1		1388/1488		4.35	4.47	4.52	4.
	e instru	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1473/1493		4.40	4.73	4.80	4.		
		terial presented es contribute to	and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		1421/1486		4.05		4.37	
	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489		4.25	4.32		4.			
Did auc	diovisua.	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.25	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.
		Discussi		-	0	•	0	0		•	4 00	000/1050	4 00	4 00	4 15	4 24	
			e to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279		4.00	4.17	4.34	4.
			uraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270		5.00	4.35	4.53	5.
		_	ir and open discussion	1	0	0	0 1	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269 862/ 878		5.00	4.35	4.55 4.11	5.
were st	peciai c	echniques success	LUI	1	U	U	Т.	U	U	U	2.00	002/ 0/0	2.00	2.00	4.05	4.11	۷.
Did +he	lah in	Laborato	ry ing of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.36	5.
			background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234		5.00	4.23	4.37	5.
_	_	_	ble for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 229		5.00		4.51	
		structor provide		1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 232		5.00		4.47	
		_	ts clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 379		5.00	4.20	4.37	5.
		Seminar															
Were as	ssigned		o the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.
			r individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.
Did res	search p	rojects contribut	e to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.
Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.70	5.
Were cr	riteria :	for grading made	clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.10	5.
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
)-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 2		Re	auir	ed fo	 or M≃	ior		0	 Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 r	
3-55					100	-1411	- Lu I	- 110	. ,	~	Ü	Gradat	_	-	1100	-	
5-83	0		0 C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	-major	
4-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0					General						-	011401 9		-	1,011		
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Electives						0	#### - Means there are not end			enouc	ηh	
P 0					_							respons				_	
			I O		Ot:	her					2	2.07		5-			
			? 0		-												

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101 University of Maryland Title MODELING/URBAN ENVIR

Baltimore County

Page 655

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C) Spring 2009 2 Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eaue:	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
		General					_	_										
		w insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50		4.50	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.50
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1392/1576	3.50	3.50	4.27	4.32	3.50
	_	estions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		583/1342	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.50
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1041/1520	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.36	4.00
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0		1448/1465	2.50	2.80	4.12	4.25	2.50
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		878/1434	4.00	3.90	4.14	4.35	4.00
		system clearly		ined	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		1041/1547	4.00	4.10	4.19	4.24	4.00
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wou	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	3.50	3.55	4.10	4.18	3.50			
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.38	4.35	4.47	4.52	4.38
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1210/1493	4.38	4.40	4.73	4.80	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	4.00	4.05	4.32	4.37	4.00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.25	4.25	4.32	4.38	4.25				
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding							0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.25	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.25
		D																
1. Did cla	ss discu	Discuss Ussions contrib		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.00	4.17	4.34	4.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1270	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.53	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1269	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.55	5.00
		chniques succes		a open arroadren	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	2.00	4.05	4.11	2.00
		Laborat	oru															
1 Did +ba	lah ina	rease understar	_	f the meterial	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.36	5.00
				ground information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.37	5.00
				or lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00
	_	structor provide			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.47	5.00
		_		early specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.47	5.00
J. WEIE IE	.quii ellen	ics for lab repo	JICS CI	earry specified		U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	1/ 3/9	3.00	3.00	1.20	4.57	3.00
		Seminar			_						_							
	_	-		announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
				ividual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.77	5.00
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.70	5.00
_		ns contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00		4.70	5.00
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.10	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	ırned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 28-55						Required for Majors 0 Graduate 2 I						Majo	or	1				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	-major	1		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General							5				3	-	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0	0									responses to be significant			_	
				I O		Ot]	her					2	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: ENCE 658 0101 University of Maryland Title

Page 656

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Spring 2009 MODELING/URBAN ENVIR Instructor: (Instr. D) 2 Enrollment:

ion Questionnaire
101

Questions					NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 1101	aain na	General	s from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.50
_	_	-	he expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1392/1576	3.50	3.50	4.27	4.43	3.50
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.50
			he expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1041/1520	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.36	4.00
			e to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	0		1448/1465	2.50	2.80	4.12	4.25	2.50
				0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434		3.90	4.14	4.35	4.00
	Did written assignments contribute to what you lear: Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	1	0	1		1041/1547	4.00	4.10	4.19	4.24	4.00
	How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.90	4.64	4.75	5.00
	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	1	1	0	0		1524/1554		3.55	4.10	4.18	3.50
1 Word +1	Lecture						0	0	2	0	4 00	1233/1488	4.38	4.35	4.47	4.52	4.38
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 						0	0	1	1		1210/1493	4.38	4.40	4.73	4.80	4.38
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						1	0	1	0		1421/1486	4.00	4.05	4.32	4.37	4.00
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	1	0		1415/1489	4.25	4.25	4.32	4.38	4.25
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	1	0	0		1149/1277	4.25	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.25
1 Did al:	ace dieci	Discussions contribute	on e to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.00	4.17	4.34	4.00
			uraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.53	5.00
			ir and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1269	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.55	5.00
		chniques success		1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	862/ 878	2.00	2.00	4.05	4.11	2.00
		Laborato:	N.1.														
1 Did +b/	o lah ind		ing of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.36	5.00
			background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.30	5.00
_	_	_	ble for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 229	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00
	_	structor provide		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.47	5.00
			ts clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 379	5.00	5.00	4.20		5.00
	-	-															
1 Maria a	aaiamad +	Seminar	o the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
	_	-	r individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.79	5.00
			e to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 72		5.00	4.69	4.70	5.00
	_	_	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.70	5.00
		for grading made		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	4.10	5.00
		, g g															
			Frequ	iency	, DIS	LT1DI	ut10	11									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S 			Ту]	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0		0 A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	r	1
28-55	0		0 в 0		_		,				0		,	0			_
56-83 84-150	0		0 C 0 0 D 0	General					0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	major	1		
Grad.	2		0 D 0 2 F 0	Electives					0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ıh		
Grau.	2	J.JU T.UU	P 0	FIECTIVES						0 #### - Means there are not end responses to be significant				_) * 		
			I O	Other						2							
			? 0	Other						•							