Course-Section: ENCH 215 0101

Title CHEM ENGINEERING ANALY

Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 51
Questionnaires: 39

ES, TARYN Fall

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 674 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	quen	cie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	4	30	4.66	446/1649	4.66	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	10	23	4.42	672/1648	4.42	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	25	4.42	641/1375	4.42	4.27	4.27	4.37	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	709/1595	4.34	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	12	20	4.44	432/1533	4.44	4.01	4.04	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	6	8	15	4.31	616/1512	4.31	4.15	4.10	4.14	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	7	24	4.42	608/1623	4.42	3.98	4.16	4.21	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	199/1646	4.97	4.66	4.69	4.63	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	185/1621	4.72	4.15	4.06	4.01	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	9	24	4.54	803/1568	4.54	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	355/1572	4.95	4.82	4.70	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	12	23	4.51	640/1564	4.51	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	8	28	4.68	499/1559	4.68	4.23	4.29	4.33	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	3	3	2	8	3.61	996/1352	3.61	3.99	3.98	4.07	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	4	7	5	11		1055/1384	3.57	3.35	4.08	3.99	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	8	10	11	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.96	4.29	4.19	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	9	4	14	3.97	981/1368	3.97	3.91		4.21	3.97
4. Were special techniques successful	10	16	3	1	5	1	3	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	2.17	3.95	3.89	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 221	****	4.70	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 243	****	4.90	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 212	****	4.80	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 209	****	4.70	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar				•	_	•								
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	1	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	****/ 288	****	3.60	3.68	3.65	****
mi al di massia														
Field Work	2.0	0	1	0	0	^	^	1 00	**** / EO	****	****	4 06	2 02	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52	****		4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1 2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39			4.47	4.49	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	2	U	2	0	10	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.67	3.68	3.68	3.59	3.67
Calf Darad														
Self Paced	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	2 50	****/ 53	****	****	4 20	4 07	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37 37	0	0	1	1 0	1	1	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30 4.16	4.07 1.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37 37	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****		3.50	****
<ol> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> <li>Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful</li> </ol>	37 37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.43	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	1	0	0	2	0		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****
J. Were there enough proceeds for all the students	33	Τ.	т	U	U	۷	U	3.00	/ 110			3.33	3.14	

Course-Section: ENCH 215 0101

Title CHEM ENGINEERING ANALY

Instructor:

BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 39 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 674 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 215H 0101 University of Maryland Title CHEM ENGR ANALYSIS-HON

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 5 Ouestionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 675 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 328/1649 4.75 4.43 4.28 4.29 4.75 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 263/1648 4.75 4.20 4.23 4.25 4.75 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 296/1375 4.75 4.27 4.27 4.37 4.75 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 818/1595 4.25 4.16 4.20 4.22 4.25 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 815/1533 4.00 4.01 4.04 4.04 4.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 0 1 3.25 1375/1512 3.25 4.15 4.10 4.14 3.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 0 2 4.00 1029/1623 4.00 3.98 4.16 4.21 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1646 5.00 4.66 4.69 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 687/1621 4.25 4.15 4.06 4.01 4.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1121/1568 4.25 4.50 4.43 4.39 4.25 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.82 4.70 4.73 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 651/1564 4.50 4.32 4.28 4.27 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 695/1559 4.50 4.23 4.29 4.33 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1352 **** 3.99 3.98 4.07 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 2 0 1 0 0 1.67 1375/1384 1.67 3.35 4.08 3.99 1.67 0 1 1 3.33 1251/1382 3.33 3.96 4.29 4.19 3.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 1 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 2 0 0 1 2.33 1351/1368 2.33 3.91 4.30 4.21 2.33 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 2 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 58/288 4.33 3.60 3.68 3.65 4.33

Field Work

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

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

Course-Section: ENCH 300 0101

Title CHEM PROC THERMODYNAMI

CASTELLANOS, MA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 31 Questionnaires: 25

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 676 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse!	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	quer	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	1	6	7	10		1218/1649	3.96	4.43	4.28	4.27	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	7	7		1395/1648	3.68	4.20	4.23	4.18	3.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1 2	4 1	5 6	9 8	6 8		1169/1375	3.60	4.27	4.27	4.22 4.21	3.60 3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	6	3	12	3.76	1280/1595 945/1533	3.76 3.88	4.16 4.01	4.20	4.21	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	6	5 6	6		1363/1512	3.28	4.15	4.10	4.05	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	11	9	4.16	915/1623	4.16	3.98	4.16	4.11	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	697/1646	4.88	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	9	5	9		1087/1621	3.88	4.15	4.06		3.88
J. now would you grade the overall reaching criceriveness	O	_	_	O		3		3.00	1007/1021	3.00	1.13	1.00	1.02	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	992/1568	4.39	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	1146/1572	4.61	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	8	4	6	3.39	1429/1564	3.39	4.32	4.28	4.25	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	4	5	9	3.65	1326/1559	3.65	4.23	4.29	4.23	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.99	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion	_	•	_	_	_							4 00		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	7	3	3	4	3		1336/1384		3.35	4.08	4.11	2.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	3	4	5	5		1259/1382	3.30	3.96	4.29	4.37	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5 2	0 1	5 2	5	4		1274/1368	3.16	3.91	4.30	4.39	3.16
4. Were special techniques successful	6	12	2	Т	2	Τ	1	2./1	898/ 948	2./1	2.17	3.95	4.00	2.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.70	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.90	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.80	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.70	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	3	0	4	0	3.14	224/ 288	3.14	3.60	3.68	3.58	3.14
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	3	0	4 00	****/ 312	****	3.68	3.68	3.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	U	U	U	U	3	U	4.00	***/ 312		3.08	3.08	3.60	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
·									,					

# Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 425 0101 University of Maryland Title TRANSPORT I:FLUIDS Baltimore County

Instructor: ROSS, JULIA Fall 2008

Enrollment: 28 Ouestionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 677 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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 1 0 0 0 5 16 4.76 317/1649 4.76 4.43 4.28 4.50 4.76 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 5 15 4.67 362/1648 4.67 4.20 4.23 4.36 4.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 6 15 4.71 347/1375 4.71 4.27 4.27 4.48 4.71 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 3 1 1 3 3 10 4.11 996/1595 4.11 4.16 4.20 4.36 4.11 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 2 5 6 5 3.63 1159/1533 3.63 4.01 4.04 4.14 3.63 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 1 2 1 2 6 3.83 1068/1512 3.83 4.15 4.10 4.26 3.83 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 2 7 12 4.48 541/1623 4.48 3.98 4.16 4.27 4.48 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 13 8 4.38 1302/1646 4.38 4.66 4.69 4.71 4.38 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 8 13 4.62 279/1621 4.62 4.15 4.06 4.24 4.62 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.50 4.43 4.54 4.89 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 640/1572 4.89 4.82 4.70 4.79 4.89 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 1 2 14 4.76 326/1564 4.76 4.32 4.28 4.40 4.76 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 227/1559 4.89 4.23 4.29 4.41 4.89 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 4 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 457/1352 4.33 3.99 3.98 4.07 4.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1384 **** 3.35 4.08 4.35 **** 19 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1382 **** 3.96 4.29 4.56 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 19 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1368 **** 3.91 4.30 4.58 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 19 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 948 **** 2.17 3.95 4.31 **** Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 14 0 1 0 2 1 4 3.88 434/555 3.88 4.33 4.29 4.41 3.88 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 16 0 0 2 0 4 0 3.33 208/288 3.33 3.60 3.68 3.71 3.33 Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0 1 0 4 0 3.60 ****/ 312 **** 3.68 3.68 3.95 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons ______ 0.00-0.99 0 A 9 Graduate 0 Major 17 00-27 1 Required for Majors 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 2.00-2.99 4 C 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 28-55 0 2.00-2.99 4 3.00-3.49 3 56-83 5 General 0 Under-grad 22 Non-major 5 84-150 4 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 16

Course-Section: ENCH 437L 0101

Title CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L

Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE

Enrollment:

15 Questionnaires: 15

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 678 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 ı															
1 Did voi:	ı gain new	insights, ski		this course	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	803/1649	4.38	4.43	4.28	4.50	4.38
		or make clear			2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	323/1648		4.20	4.23	4.36	4.69
		stions reflect			2	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375		4.27	4.27	4.48	5.00
		tions reflect			2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	291/1595		4.16	4.20	4.36	4.69
				nat you learned	2	5	0	0	2	1	-	4.38	505/1533		4.01	4.04	4.14	4.38
	_	-		what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	5		4.58	324/1512		4.15	4.10	4.26	4.58
		system clearly			2	0	1	0	0	4	-		659/1623		3.98	4.16	4.27	4.38
		as class cance	-	100	2	1	0	0	2	7	-		1513/1646		4.66	4.69	4.71	
				ing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6			1151/1621		4.15		4.24	
		Lecture	<b>a</b>															
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lectures	_	repared	3	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.50	4.43	4.54	4.00
		or seem inter			3	0	0	1	1	0	10		1165/1572		4.82	4.70	4.79	4.58
				plained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	5			1028/1564		4.32	4.28		4.17
		contribute to			3	0	2	1	0	4			1277/1559		4.23	4.29	4.41	
			_	ur understanding	3	0	1	2	2	3			1011/1352		3.99		4.07	
		_	_	5														
1 Did ala	aa diaana	Discuss		nat you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.35	4.08	4.35	4.50
				to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	394/1382		3.96	4.29	4.56	4.75
		_	_	open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	-	4.75	426/1368		3.91	4.30	4.58	4.75
		hniques succes		open arroadren	11	2	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 948		2.17	3.95	4.31	****
		Laborat	orv															
1 Did the	lah inar	ease understa	-	the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	41/ 221	4.70	4.70	4.16	4.73	4.70
				cound information	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	23/ 243		4.90	4.12		
				lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	-	4.80	50/ 212		4.80	4.40	4.57	4.80
		ructor provide			5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	63/ 209		4.70	4.35	4.63	4.70
				arly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	246/ 555		4.33	4.29		4.78
	1	_			-	-	-	-		_	-							
5 Were cr	riteria fo	Semina r grading made			14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 288	****	3 60	3 68	3.71	***
J. Nere er	icciia io					Ü	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	J	2.00	, 200		3.00	3.00	3.71	
E Did con	forongog	Field W		eld activities	11	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	279/ 312	2 50	2 60	2 60	2 05	2 50
3. Did coi.	irerences	neip you carry	y Out II	eid activities	11	U	U	3	O	1	U	2.50	210/ 312	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.73	2.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ition	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	1	 A 7		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3												5 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	neral	_				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									_					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	0						
				? 1														

Course-Section: ENCH 444 0101

Title PROCESS ENGINEERING EC

Instructor: TOUREE, DAN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 679 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled	0 0 1 0 1 0	0 0 14 1 6 4 5	0 1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0 0	0 4 0 0 1 3 3	4 3 0 4 5 2 3	14 10 3 12 5 9	4.59 4.36 4.43 3.69	306/1649 999/1648 ****/1375 405/1595 515/1533 493/1512 1303/1623 1193/1646	4.78 4.17 **** 4.59 4.36 4.43 3.69 4.50	4.43 4.20 4.27 4.16 4.01 4.15 3.98 4.66	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69	4.50 4.36 4.48 4.36 4.14 4.26 4.27 4.71	4.78 4.17 **** 4.59 4.36 4.43 3.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2			4.38		4.38	4.15		4.24	
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful  Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1 1 1 2 15 15 15 15 15	0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0	2 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0	2 1 2 1 0 0 0 0 0 0	3	4.86 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	355/1572		3.35 3.96 3.91 2.17			4.86 **** **** ****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 312	****	3.68	3.68	3.95	****
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	***
Frequ	ency.	Dist	rib	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27		Ger	era:	1	or Ma	jor		0 0 0 6	Graduat Under-g #### - I response	rad 1 Means t		re not	major enoug	17 1 h

Course-Section: ENCH 445 0101 University of Maryland Title SEPARATION PROCESSES Baltimore County Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS Fall 2008

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 680

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
		ew insights,skil			2	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	683/1649	4.47	4.43	4.28	4.50	4.47
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53		4.53	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.53
		uestions reflect			1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	334/1375	4.72	4.27	4.27	4.48	4.72
		uations reflect	_	-	1	3	0	1	3	5	6		1032/1595	4.07	4.16	4.20	4.36	4.07
	-	eadings contribu		-	2	7	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	,	4.20	4.01	4.04	4.14	4.20
		signments contri		-	2	7 0	0	1	1	2	6		627/1512	4.30	4.15	4.10	4.26	4.30
		g system clearly		a	1	•	0	0	0	6			321/1623	4.67	3.98	4.16	4.27	4.67
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	2	2	6 9	12		1037/1646	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.71	4.67
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overal	1 teachin	g effectiveness	0	0	U	2	2	9	6	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.15	4.06	4.24	4.00
		Lecture																
		actor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	442/1568	4.78	4.50	4.43	4.54	4.78
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.82	4.70	4.79	4.67
		terial presented			1	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	971/1564	4.22	4.32	4.28	4.40	4.22
		es contribute to			1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	777/1559		4.23	4.29	4.41	4.44
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	ance your	understanding	3	5	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	872/1352	3.82	3.99	3.98	4.07	3.82
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu		t vou learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.35	4.08	4.35	4.00
		nts actively enc		-	14	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	3.96	4.29	4.56	4.00
		ctor encourage f			14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	876/1368	4.20	3.91	4.30	4.58	4.20
		echniques succes			14	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	***	2.17	3.95	4.31	****
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were re	equiremer	nts for lab repo	_	ly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.33	4.29	4.41	****
			. 1															
5. Did cor	nferences	Field W s help you carry		d activities	16	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	3.68	3.68	3.95	****
		77											,					
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 aior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						J								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	h
				P 0														
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.8	-					
				? 0														
Grau.	Ü	3.30 1.00	J	P 0 I 0				ves				-	respons					

Course-Section: ENCH 482 0101 University of Maryland BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERIN

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: MARTEN, MARK

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 681 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	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 n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	696/1649	4.46	4.43	4.28	4.50	4.46
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	920/1648	4.23	4.20	4.23	4.36	4.23
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	823/1375	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.48	4.23
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	3	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.16	4.20	4.36	4.40
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.01	4.04	4.14	4.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	451/1512	4.45	4.15	4.10	4.26	4.45
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1164/1623	3.92	3.98	4.16	4.27	3.92
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1230/1646	4.46	4.66	4.69	4.71	4.46
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.15	4.06	4.24	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1002/1568	4.38	4.50	4.43	4.54	4.38
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572		4.82	4.70	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	, -	4.31	4.32	4.28	4.40	4.31
		es contribute t			0	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	980/1559	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.41	4.23
				our understanding	0	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	501/1352			3.98	4.07	
J. Dia aa	alovibaa	i ccciniiqueb cii	ilailee j	our underscanding	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	-	-	3	1.27	301/1332	1.27	3.33	3.50	1.07	1.27
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	275/1384	4.73	3.35	4.08	4.35	4.73
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.91	3.96	4.29	4.56	4.91
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	461/1368	4.73	3.91	4.30	4.58	4.73
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful	-	2	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	***	2.17	3.95	4.31	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria	for grading mad			12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.60	3.68	3.71	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference			ield activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.68	3.68	3.95	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Constitute D		G GD3		Down and a discount of				D -									24	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке:	asons				Ту:	pe 			Majors 	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					9						

#### Course-Section: ENCH 610 0101 University of Maryland Page 682 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 CHEM. ENG. THERMODYNAM Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LOEHE, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	;		Inst	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 vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1057/1649	4.17	4.43	4.28	4.46	4.17
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	4.20	4.23	4.34	3.67
		uestions reflec			1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1071/1375	3.83	4.27	4.27	4.44	3.83
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1242/1595	3.83	4.16	4.20	4.35	3.83
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	703/1533	4.17	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.17
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.15	4.10	4.35	4.50
		g system clearl			1	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	3.98	4.16	4.29	3.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.81	5.00
				ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.15	4.06	4.20	4.20
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.80
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.32	4.28	4.41	3.80
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1513/1559	2.80	4.23	4.29	4.41	2.80
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1270/1352	2.80	3.99	3.98	4.10	2.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1209/1384	3.20	3.35	4.08	4.30	3.20
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	716/1382	4.40	3.96	4.29	4.52	4.40
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	4.40	3.91	4.30	4.56	4.40
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		2	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	917/ 948	2.50	2.17	3.95	4.03	2.50
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	ı			Ty	ne			Majors	<b>:</b>
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1				_	βh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

5

Ι

?

0

0

Course-Section: ENCH 664 8010

University of Maryland QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

MOREIRA, ANTONI (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 683

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		0	~		רדע	NT 70		_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sec
		Questions 	5 		NR 	NA 			3 	4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General	1															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.43	4.28	4.46	4.5
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.3
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	4		4.33	,	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.
		uations reflect			0	3	0	0	0	4		4.33				4.20	4.35	
				hat you learned	2	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1			380/1512		4.15			
		g system clearly		ned	0	0	0	1	1	2			849/1623		3.98	4.16	4.29	
	_	was class cance			0	0	0	1	0	0			1037/1646				4.81	
. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overal	ll teach	ing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.15	4.06	4.20	4.
		Lecture	е															
		uctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	442/1568	4.76	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	2			894/1572		4.82		4.83	4.
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.78	,				4.41	
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	2			361/1559		4.23		4.41	
Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance you	ur understanding	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	423/1352	4.59	3.99	3.98	4.10	4.
		Discus	sion															
Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ute to w	hat you learned	2	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1232/1384	3.14	3.35	4.08	4.30	3
Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1122/1382	3.71	3.96	4.29	4.52	3.
Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1051/1368	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.56	3.
. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		2	3	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	942/ 948	1.75	2.17	3.95	4.03	1.
		Laborat	tory															
. Were yo	ou provid	ded with adequat	te backg	round information	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.90	4.12	4.61	* *
. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.66	* *
		Field V	Work															
. Did fie	eld exper	rience contribut	te to wha	at you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	**
Did cor	nferences	s help you carry	y out fi	eld activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.68	3.68	3.83	4.
		Self I	Paced															
Were th	nere enou	ugh proctors for	r all the	e students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	* *
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
 00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2			nuir		or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		2	 Majo		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1/6/	1u11	-u 1	J. 1.1C	نتار،	_	9	Graduat	_	_	ria je	·-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	
34-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001	a	-				-	onder 9		•	1,011		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E] 6	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	яh
	-	3.30 1.00	•	P 0								_	respons					,
				I O		Ot1	her					2	10050110					
				5 0		001						•						

Course-Section: ENCH 664 8010 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

Page 684 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies						Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.43	4.28	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	1	0	3	5	4.33			4.20	4.23	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	1	4	4	4.33			4.27	4.27		4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	4	2	4.33			4.16	4.20		4.33	
				what you learned	0 2	3 2	0	0	1	3		4.00			4.01	4.04	4.28	4.00	
				o what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1			380/1512		4.15	4.10		4.50	
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	2			849/1623		3.98	4.16		4.22	
		was class canc			0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.81	4.67	
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	ne instruc	tor's lecture	_	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.76	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.76	
		or seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	,		4.82	4.70		4.76	
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	, -		4.32	4.28	4.41	4.76	
		contribute t			6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	- ,		4.23	4.29	4.41		
				our understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67					4.10	4.59	
ו הים ו		Discus			2	0	2	1	0	2	2	2 1 4	1020/1204	2 1 4	2 25	4.08	4 20	2 11	
				what you learned d to participate	2 2	0	1	1	1	2			1232/1384 1122/1382		3.35	4.00	4.30 4.52	3.14 3.71	
		_	_	d open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	3		1051/1368		3.91	4.30		3.71	
		chniques succe		d Open discussion	2	3	2	1	1	0	-		942/ 948				4.03		
1. MOIO DE	,00141 000	Junit 4 acc			_	J	_	_	_	Ü	Ū	1.75	712, 710	2.75		3.73	1.05	1.75	
_		Labora			_				_										
				ground information	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 243		4.90	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.33	4.29	4.66	****	
		Field	Work																
				hat you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****	
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.68	3.68	3.83	4.00	
		Self	Paced																
5. Were th	nere enoug			he students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	****	3.99	3.92	****	
				Frequ	encv	Dist	-rih	ıt i oı	า										
				11040	CIICI	DID		40101	-										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	or	1	
28-55																			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	8	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								•			,			,	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### -					n	
				P 0		O+1						2	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	10		
1 0						Otł	ıer					2	۷						
				<i>:</i> U															

Course-Section: ENCH 664 8010 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 685

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions				MID	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Mean	ructor Rank		Dept	Mean	Level	Sect Mean
		Question	ь 									Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you g	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.43	4.28	4.46	4.56				
2. Did the i	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.33				
3. Did the e	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.33				
		tions reflect			0	3	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.33
5. Did assig	gned read	dings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	2	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.00
6. Did writt	en assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.15	4.10	4.35	4.50
		system clearly		ned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	849/1623	4.22	3.98	4.16	4.29	4.22
8. How many	times wa	as class canc	elled		0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.81	4.67
		Lecture	۵															
1. Were the	instruct	tor's lecture	_	repared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.76	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.76
2. Did the i	instructo	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.76
				plained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	342/1564		4.32	4.28	4.41	4.76
		contribute to			6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.69	4.23	4.29	4.41	4.69
				ur understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352			3.98	4.10	4.59
		Discus																
1 Did aloas				hat was learned	2	0	2	1	0	2	2	2 1/	1232/1384	2 1/	3.35	4.08	4.30	3.14
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	1	0	1	3	2		1122/1382		3.96	4.08	4.52	3.71
					2 2	0	1	0	1	2	3		1051/1368		3.90	4.29	4.56	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful					2	3	2	1	1	0	0		942/ 948					1.75
4. Were spec	ciai teci	initques succe	SSIUI		2	3	2	Τ.	_	U	U	1.75	942/ 940	1.75	2.17	3.95	4.03	1.75
		Labora																
				round information	7	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 243	****	4.90	4.12	4.61	****
5. Were requ	uirement	s for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.66	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did field	d experie	ence contribu	te to wh	at you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****
				eld activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.68	3.68	3.83	4.00
5. Were ther	re enoual	Self : h proctors fo		e students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****
								-	-		-		,					
				Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	1
	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			-10-11		10	. , , , , ,	-	-	01 44440	-	_			-
						Ge:	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	8
	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				5	-
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
			-	P 0		_							respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.	her					2						
				? 0		20.												

Course-Section: ENCH 664 8010 University of Maryland

Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Title QC/QA BIOTECH PRODUCTS
Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 686 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							0	0	0	4	5	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.43	4.28	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	1	0	3	5	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	1	4	-	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.33
		ations reflect			0	0 3	0	0	0	4		4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.33
				what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	3		4.00	815/1533		4.01	4.04	4.28	4.00
				o what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1		4.50	380/1512		4.15	4.10	4.35	4.50
		system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	2			849/1623	4.22	3.98	4.16	4.29	4.22
		was class canc		11100	0	0	0	1	0	0	8		1037/1646			4.69		4.67
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.76	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.76
		tor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.76
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	342/1564	4.76	4.32	4.28	4.41	4.76
		s contribute t			6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.69	4.23	4.29	4.41	4.69
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.59	3.99	3.98	4.10	4.59
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1232/1384	3.14	3.35	4.08	4.30	3.14
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1122/1382	3.71	3.96	4.29	4.52	3.71
3. Did th	e instruct	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1051/1368	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.56	3.86
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful	-	2	3	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	942/ 948	1.75	2.17	3.95	4.03	1.75
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	ou provide	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.90	4.12	4.61	****
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.33	4.29	4.66	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did fi	eld experi	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****
				ield activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.68	3.68	3.83	4.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors fo		he students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									
Constitute D		G GDA		-	-												20-1	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons				Ту]	ре 			Majors 	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	or	1
28-55																_		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	8
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	gh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
I 0					Other						2							
	? 0																	

Course-Section: ENCH 686 0101

Title SURVEY OF SENS & INSTR

Instructor: RAO, GOVIND

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 687 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insig	0	0	2	5	6	9	5	3.37	1531/1649	3.37	4.43	4.28	4.46	3.37		
2. Did the instructor mak	0	0	6	6	8	5	2	2.67	1625/1648	2.67	4.20	4.23	4.34	2.67		
3. Did the exam questions	0	6	4	3	8	4	2	2.86	1346/1375	2.86	4.27	4.27	4.44	2.86		
4. Did other evaluations	1	2	5	4	6	7	2	2.88	1557/1595	2.88	4.16	4.20	4.35	2.88		
5. Did assigned readings	contribute to	what you learned	0	12	3	2	3	4	3	3.13	1411/1533	3.13	4.01	4.04	4.28	3.13
6. Did written assignment	s contribute to	what you learned	1	6	3	3	6	4	4	3.15	1406/1512	3.15		4.10	4.35	3.15
7. Was the grading system	clearly explai	ined	0	12	7	3	2	2	1	2.13	1613/1623	2.13	3.98	4.16	4.29	2.13
8. How many times was cla	ss cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	1112/1646	4.59	4.66	4.69	4.81	4.59
9. How would you grade th	e overall teach	ning effectiveness	8	0	3	2	6	8	0	3.00	1504/1621	3.00	4.15	4.06	4.20	3.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's	lectures well p	prepared	2	0	1	5	6	6	7	3.52	1456/1568	3.52	4.50	4.43	4.52	3.52
2. Did the instructor see	m interested in	n the subject	2	0	1	0	1	0	23	4.76	912/1572	4.76	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.76
3. Was lecture material p	resented and ex	xplained clearly	2	0	3	3	9	6	4	3.20	1472/1564	3.20	4.32	4.28	4.41	3.20
4. Did the lectures contr	ibute to what	you learned	2	0	5	5	8	4	3	2.80	1513/1559	2.80	4.23	4.29	4.41	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techni	ques enhance y	our understanding	4	2	3	2	6	7	3	3.24	1166/1352	3.24	3.99	3.98	4.10	3.24
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussions	contribute to	what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1384	****	3.35	4.08	4.30	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/1382	****	3.96	4.29	4.52	****
3. Did the instructor end	ourage fair and	d open discussion	21	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/1368	****	3.91	4.30	4.56	****
4. Were special technique	s successful		21	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	****	2.17	3.95	4.03	****
	Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for	lab reports cle	early specified	21	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.66	***
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grad	ling made clear		22	0	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	****/ 288	***	3.60	3.68	3.87	****
	Field Work															
5. Did conferences help y	ou carry out f	ield activities	19	0	0	3	0	5	0	3.25	247/ 312	3.25	3.68	3.68	3.83	3.25
	Self Paced															
5. Were there enough prod	tors for all th	ne students	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Crodita Farnod				Pos	asons				Ту				Majors			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades																
	-0.99 0	A 10		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	3	Graduat	е	9	Majo	or	12
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 1 B 10 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 0				Cor	nera:	1			1	Λ	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non	-major	15
	20 03 0 2.00 2.33 3 0 0				ıcıd.	L			Т	U	onder-g.	Lau I	. 0	MOII-	ilia JOL	13
		F 0		רק.	ectiv	760				4	#### - 1	Meane +	here -	re not	enous	rh
Grad. 9 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 P 0				n T C	-C L I \	v CD				1	respons				_	11
I 0				Other						0	T CBPOIIS		C DIGI	cai.		
? 5				001					-	-						