

Course-Section: ENCH 225 0101  
 Title: CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING  
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 629  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.26	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	910/1285	4.05	4.34	4.30	4.36	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	682/1476	4.35	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	4	3	1	6	3.64	1088/1412	3.64	3.76	4.06	4.00	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	779/1381	4.05	4.23	4.08	3.97	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	720/1500	4.32	4.02	4.18	4.20	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.84	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	744/1497	4.18	4.15	4.11	4.11	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1225/1440	3.94	4.42	4.45	4.42	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	954/1448	4.71	4.74	4.71	4.78	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1029/1436	4.06	4.31	4.29	4.29	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	942/1432	4.18	4.17	4.29	4.31	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	373/1221	4.38	3.84	3.93	4.02	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.80	4.32	4.10	4.08	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.48	4.34	4.33	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.43	4.31	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.76	4.02	4.00	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	134/ 215	4.22	4.61	4.36	4.62	4.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	160/ 228	4.22	4.54	4.35	4.56	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 217	4.78	4.73	4.51	4.57	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	64/ 216	4.78	4.75	4.42	4.72	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	46/ 205	4.67	4.50	4.23	4.37	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: ENCH 225 0101  
 Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING  
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 629  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	2	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 427 0101  
 Title TRANS PROC II:MASS TRA  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 630  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	7	25	4.73	365/1522	4.73	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	395/1522	4.64	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	6	22	4.42	626/1285	4.42	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	6	6	18	4.32	713/1476	4.32	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	5	9	15	4.27	557/1412	4.27	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	1	7	8	11	3.68	1092/1381	3.68	4.23	4.08	4.21	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	1	9	19	4.34	690/1500	4.34	4.02	4.18	4.25	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	6	24	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	355/1497	4.54	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	412/1440	4.77	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	683/1448	4.84	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	7	21	4.55	551/1436	4.55	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	4	24	4.65	478/1432	4.65	4.17	4.29	4.34	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	2	1	5	4	5	3.53	891/1221	3.53	3.84	3.93	4.04	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1061/1280	3.44	4.32	4.10	4.28	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1074/1269	3.67	4.43	4.31	4.49	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	3	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.61	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.54	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.73	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.75	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.50	4.23	3.85	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	5
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Graduate	1
				Under-grad	34
				Major	33
				Non-major	2
				#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	31	
?	1			

Course-Section: ENCH 440 0101  
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING KINET  
 Instructor: ROSS, JULIA  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 631  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	13	16	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	18	4.32	799/1522	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	7	17	4.26	766/1285	4.26	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	2	5	11	8	3.96	1056/1476	3.96	4.37	4.22	4.31	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	10	8	11	3.97	812/1412	3.97	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	2	7	10	5	3.44	1179/1381	3.44	4.23	4.08	4.21	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	11	19	4.58	406/1500	4.58	4.02	4.18	4.25	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	487/1517	4.90	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	8	11	4	3.64	1215/1497	3.64	4.15	4.11	4.21	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	320/1440	4.82	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	2	7	16	4.33	1271/1448	4.33	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	588/1436	4.52	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	9	17	4.46	682/1432	4.46	4.17	4.29	4.34	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	4	0	6	4	2	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.84	3.93	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	****/1280	****	4.32	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/1277	****	4.48	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	****/1269	****	4.43	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	2	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 32 Non-major 3
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 7	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 441 0101  
 Title RXN KINETICS IN BIOENG  
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 632  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 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	1	3	6	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	735/1476	4.30	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1112/1412	3.60	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	713/1381	4.14	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.02	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.84	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1241/1448	4.40	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1170/1432	3.80	4.17	4.29	4.34	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	983/1221	3.33	3.84	3.93	4.04	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1280	****	4.32	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.48	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.43	4.31	4.49	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	74/ 215	4.60	4.61	4.36	4.47	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	114/ 228	4.40	4.54	4.35	4.32	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	150/ 217	4.40	4.73	4.51	4.55	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/ 216	4.80	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	67/ 205	4.50	4.50	4.23	3.85	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 442 0101  
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING SYS A  
 Instructor: SMITH, JEFFREY  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 633  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	11	18	4.57	537/1522	4.57	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	8	22	4.73	298/1285	4.73	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	504/1476	4.48	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	2	5	9	9	4.00	760/1412	4.00	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	382/1381	4.46	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	10	14	4.24	789/1500	4.24	4.02	4.18	4.25	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	195/1517	4.96	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	833/1497	4.11	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	10	19	4.66	617/1440	4.66	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	521/1448	4.90	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	696/1436	4.43	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	4	21	4.59	548/1432	4.59	4.17	4.29	4.34	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	875/1221	3.56	3.84	3.93	4.04	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1280	****	4.32	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1277	****	4.48	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1269	****	4.43	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 27
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 32 Non-major 5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCH 446 0101  
 Title PROC ENGINEERING ECON  
 Instructor: CASTELLANOS, MA  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 634  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	18	4.95	106/1522	4.95	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	419/1522	4.61	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	731/1285	4.30	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	130/1381	4.79	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	615/1500	4.41	4.02	4.18	4.25	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	292/1517	4.95	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	288/1497	4.63	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	884/1432	4.25	4.17	4.29	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.84	3.93	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	317/1277	4.80	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.43	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	88/ 854	4.80	4.76	4.02	4.31	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENCH 450 0101  
 Title CHEM PROCESS DEVELOPME  
 Instructor: RUDESILL, ALLEN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 635  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	3	2	3	3.36	1447/1522	3.36	4.42	4.30	4.42	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1238/1522	3.82	4.26	4.26	4.34	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	871/1476	4.18	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1272/1412	3.30	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	753/1381	4.10	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1357/1500	3.40	4.02	4.18	4.25	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.84	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	6	3	1	3.36	1337/1497	3.36	4.15	4.11	4.21	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1071/1440	4.22	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1165/1436	3.89	4.31	4.29	4.32	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1291/1432	3.44	4.17	4.29	4.34	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	786/1221	3.75	3.84	3.93	4.04	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	381/1269	4.75	4.43	4.31	4.49	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 484 0101  
 Title BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING  
 Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 636  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	663/1412	4.14	3.76	4.06	4.11	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	643/1381	4.21	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.02	4.18	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	873/1517	4.71	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1006/1497	3.92	4.15	4.11	4.21	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	669/1440	4.62	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	965/1448	4.69	4.74	4.71	4.75	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	741/1436	4.38	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	600/1432	4.54	4.17	4.29	4.34	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	387/1221	4.36	3.84	3.93	4.04	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.32	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.48	4.34	4.50	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	299/1269	4.83	4.43	4.31	4.49	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.76	4.02	4.31	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		12
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	8

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENCH 485L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEM ENGINEERING LA  
 Instructor: RAO, GOVIND  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 637  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	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	0	4	5	4.56	548/1522	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	639/1522	4.44	4.26	4.26	4.34	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.42	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1127/1412	3.57	3.76	4.06	4.11	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	233/1381	4.63	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1461/1500	2.71	4.02	4.18	4.25	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	767/1517	4.78	4.84	4.65	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	820/1497	4.11	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.42	4.45	4.52	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.74	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.31	4.29	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	3.84	3.93	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1280	****	4.32	4.10	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.48	4.34	4.50	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.43	4.31	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.31	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.61	4.36	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	4.54	4.35	4.32	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.73	4.51	4.55	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	90/ 216	4.67	4.75	4.42	4.20	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	96/ 205	4.33	4.50	4.23	3.85	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 630 0101  
 Title TRANSPORT PHENOMENA  
 Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 638  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	1	0	4	6	4.36	779/1522	4.36	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	945/1522	4.18	4.26	4.26	4.29	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	682/1285	4.36	4.34	4.30	4.31	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	566/1476	4.44	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	1165/1412	3.50	3.76	4.06	4.25	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	575/1381	4.29	4.23	4.08	4.25	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	670/1500	4.36	4.02	4.18	4.22	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.84	4.65	4.73	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	336/1440	4.82	4.42	4.45	4.48	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.74	4.71	4.80	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	855/1436	4.27	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	869/1432	4.27	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	606/1221	4.00	3.84	3.93	3.83	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.32	4.10	4.24	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.48	4.34	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.43	4.31	4.51	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 640 0101  
 Title ADV CHEM REACTN KINETI  
 Instructor: MARTEN, MARK  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 639  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	0	4	4.14	1012/1522	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	844/1522	4.29	4.26	4.26	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	745/1285	4.29	4.34	4.30	4.31	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	913/1476	4.14	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	932/1412	3.86	3.76	4.06	4.25	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.23	4.08	4.25	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1117/1500	3.86	4.02	4.18	4.22	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1331/1517	4.14	4.84	4.65	4.73	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	756/1497	4.17	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1349/1440	3.57	4.42	4.45	4.48	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1224/1448	4.43	4.74	4.71	4.80	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	1330/1432	3.29	4.17	4.29	4.33	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	860/1221	3.60	3.84	3.93	3.83	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4.32	4.10	4.24	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.48	4.34	4.52	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	836/1269	4.14	4.43	4.31	4.51	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 666 0101  
 Title BIOTECH FAC DESIGN  
 Instructor: MOREIRA, ANTONI  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 640  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	733/1522	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1323/1522	3.60	4.26	4.26	4.29	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1285	4.83	4.34	4.30	4.31	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	285/1476	4.70	4.37	4.22	4.31	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1165/1412	3.50	3.76	4.06	4.25	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	247/1381	4.60	4.23	4.08	4.25	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1280/1500	3.56	4.02	4.18	4.22	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.84	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.15	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.42	4.45	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.74	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.31	4.29	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	502/1432	4.63	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	480/1221	4.22	3.84	3.93	3.83	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280	4.17	4.32	4.10	4.24	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	867/1277	4.17	4.48	4.34	4.52	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.43	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.76	4.02	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.54	4.35	4.39	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.66	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.30	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.63	4.82	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 4
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 6
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 2

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant