

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 215 2
Title:	Chem Engineering Analy
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	265/1528	4.79	4.37	4.31	4.34	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	396/1527	4.64	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	4	19	4.43	676/1333	4.43	4.35	4.34	4.40	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	2	3	6	16	4.33	746/1495	4.33	4.11	4.25	4.28	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	530/1439	4.37	4.01	4.11	4.12	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	3	5	6	9	3.91	967/1425	3.91	4.19	4.12	4.11	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	5	6	15	4.38	613/1508	4.38	4.24	4.18	4.19	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	1052/1526	4.52	4.70	4.66	4.64	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	289/1490	4.57	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.57
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	368/1428	4.81	4.57	4.49	4.48	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	413/1436	4.93	4.77	4.74	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	420/1427	4.67	4.25	4.32	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	422/1425	4.70	4.24	4.34	4.37	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	4	0	3	0	6	3.31	1126/1291	3.31	3.97	4.05	4.14	3.31
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	342/1271	4.64	4.16	4.16	4.21	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	727/1276	4.36	4.21	4.33	4.37	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.48	4.38	4.43	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	467/922	4.00	3.93	4.02	4.11	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 215 2
Title:	Chem Engineering Analy
Instructor:	Bayles, Taryn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/198	****	4.36	4.16	4.41	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/208	****	4.33	4.27	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.56	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/194	****	3.75	4.37	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/176	****	3.75	4.23	4.18	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	3.91	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.15	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.95	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	3.95	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	3.75	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 215 2
Title:	Chem Engineering Analy
Instructor:	Bayles, Taryn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	59
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	3.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	3.77	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Graduate	Major 25
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	Under-grad	Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 7		
			Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			Other 0		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 215H 2
Title:	Chem Engr Analysis-Honor
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.37	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	410/1527	4.64	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	634/1333	4.45	4.35	4.34	4.40	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	785/1495	4.30	4.11	4.25	4.28	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	797/1439	4.10	4.01	4.11	4.12	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1056/1425	3.80	4.19	4.12	4.11	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	220/1508	4.73	4.24	4.18	4.19	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	853/1526	4.73	4.70	4.66	4.64	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	530/1490	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.11	4.38
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	534/1428	4.73	4.57	4.49	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	577/1427	4.55	4.25	4.32	4.33	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	393/1425	4.73	4.24	4.34	4.37	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1291	4.75	3.97	4.05	4.14	4.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	549/1271	4.40	4.16	4.16	4.21	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1128/1276	3.60	4.21	4.33	4.37	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.48	4.38	4.43	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.11	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 215H 2
Title:	Chem Engr Analysis-Honor
Instructor:	Bayles, Taryn M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	11

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 300 1
Title:	Chem Proc Thermodynamics
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	6	9	11	7	3.36	1441/1528	3.36	4.37	4.31	4.34	3.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	7	11	12	5	1	2.50	1513/1527	2.50	4.23	4.28	4.27	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	12	6	10	6	3.17	1296/1333	3.17	4.35	4.34	4.34	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	7	5	8	3	0	2.30	1490/1495	2.30	4.11	4.25	4.28	2.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	6	16	9	3.88	974/1439	3.88	4.01	4.11	4.13	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	4	3	5	12	5	3.38	1272/1425	3.38	4.19	4.12	4.17	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	6	8	9	8	4	2.89	1450/1508	2.89	4.24	4.18	4.17	2.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.70	4.66	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	7	7	13	4	0	2.45	1465/1490	2.45	4.08	4.11	4.11	2.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	13	12	8	3.69	1329/1428	3.69	4.57	4.49	4.48	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	3	10	21	4.36	1277/1436	4.36	4.77	4.74	4.74	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	15	12	7	2	0	1.89	1422/1427	1.89	4.25	4.32	4.31	1.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	19	4	9	3	1	1.97	1418/1425	1.97	4.24	4.34	4.34	1.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	3	11	10	3	0	2.48	1259/1291	2.48	3.97	4.05	4.09	2.48
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	11	5	4	0	2	1.95	1259/1271	1.95	4.16	4.16	4.19	1.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	8	5	3	4	2	2.41	1263/1276	2.41	4.21	4.33	4.37	2.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	5	6	3	5	2	2.67	1254/1273	2.67	4.48	4.38	4.40	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	16	18	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.02	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 300 1
Title:	Chem Proc Thermodynamics
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.33	4.27	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.56	4.59	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	7
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	10						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	44

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	8	35	4.81	230/1528	4.81	4.37	4.31	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	37	4.86	152/1527	4.86	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	37	4.86	183/1333	4.86	4.35	4.34	4.37	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	3	10	23	4.56	432/1495	4.56	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	3	4	13	16	4.08	807/1439	4.08	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	4	7	24	4.57	329/1425	4.57	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	9	31	4.69	250/1508	4.69	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	23	17	4.36	1201/1526	4.36	4.70	4.66	4.71	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	102/1490	4.86	4.08	4.11	4.19	4.86
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	155/1428	4.93	4.57	4.49	4.54	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	7	35	4.79	854/1436	4.79	4.77	4.74	4.75	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	37	4.86	174/1427	4.86	4.25	4.32	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	35	4.83	242/1425	4.83	4.24	4.34	4.37	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	10	9	19	4.24	553/1291	4.24	3.97	4.05	4.10	4.24
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	429/1271	4.52	4.16	4.16	4.33	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	574/1276	4.52	4.21	4.33	4.49	4.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	4	3	14	4.48	663/1273	4.48	4.48	4.38	4.55	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	23	5	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	360/922	4.25	3.93	4.02	4.23	4.25



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	44

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	9
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	12	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	11						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 1
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	3	6	7	3.80	1280/1528	3.80	4.37	4.31	4.39	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1113/1527	4.00	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1145/1333	3.80	4.35	4.34	4.37	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	952/1495	4.15	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	963/1439	3.90	4.01	4.11	4.20	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	613/1425	4.30	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	722/1508	4.30	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	1044/1526	4.53	4.70	4.66	4.71	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	6	10	2	3.78	1136/1490	3.78	4.08	4.11	4.19	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1145/1428	4.15	4.57	4.49	4.54	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1213/1436	4.46	4.77	4.74	4.75	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1052/1427	4.08	4.25	4.32	4.37	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	3	6	2	3.62	1270/1425	3.62	4.24	4.34	4.37	3.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	937/1291	3.75	3.97	4.05	4.10	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/1271	****	4.16	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1276	****	4.21	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1273	****	4.48	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 1
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	93/198	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.37	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	107/208	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	131/194	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	175/194	3.75	3.75	4.37	4.45	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	5	1	5	3.75	147/176	3.75	3.75	4.23	3.87	3.75
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 1
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 445 1
Title:	Separation Processes
Instructor:	Frey,Douglas D

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	785/1528	4.39	4.37	4.31	4.39	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	672/1527	4.44	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	282/1333	4.76	4.35	4.34	4.37	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	942/1495	4.17	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	6	1	4	3.27	1311/1439	3.27	4.01	4.11	4.20	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1296/1425	3.30	4.19	4.12	4.26	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	489/1508	4.47	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	881/1526	4.71	4.70	4.66	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	10	4	4.00	911/1490	4.00	4.08	4.11	4.19	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	669/1428	4.65	4.57	4.49	4.54	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	774/1436	4.82	4.77	4.74	4.75	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	882/1427	4.29	4.25	4.32	4.37	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	901/1425	4.29	4.24	4.34	4.37	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	4	0	6	2	3.50	1061/1291	3.50	3.97	4.05	4.10	3.50
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1271	****	4.16	4.16	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1276	****	4.21	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1273	****	4.48	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 445 1
Title:	Separation Processes
Instructor:	Frey,Douglas D

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	34
Questionnaires:	19

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8 Required for Majors	17	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 1 General	0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	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	0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 482 1
Title:	Biochemical Engineering
Instructor:	Marten,Mark R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	521/1528	4.60	4.37	4.31	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	737/1527	4.40	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	351/1333	4.70	4.35	4.34	4.37	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	657/1495	4.40	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	605/1439	4.30	4.01	4.11	4.20	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	583/1425	4.33	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	722/1508	4.30	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1393/1526	4.10	4.70	4.66	4.71	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	494/1490	4.40	4.08	4.11	4.19	4.40
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1428	5.00	4.57	4.49	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.77	4.74	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	625/1427	4.50	4.25	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	667/1425	4.50	4.24	4.34	4.37	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	993/1291	3.67	3.97	4.05	4.10	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	152/1271	4.89	4.16	4.16	4.33	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.21	4.33	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1273	5.00	4.48	4.38	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/922	4.75	3.93	4.02	4.23	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 482 1
Title:	Biochemical Engineering
Instructor:	Marten,Mark R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	10

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	6 Graduate	2 Major
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2 General	0	8 Non-major
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	2	
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 486 1
Title:	Survey Sensors & Instru
Instructor:	Rao, Govind

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	555/1528	4.57	4.37	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	1085/1527	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	704/1333	4.40	4.35	4.34	4.37	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	785/1495	4.30	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1008/1439	3.82	4.01	4.11	4.20	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	669/1425	4.25	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	4	1	7	5	3.47	1329/1508	3.47	4.24	4.18	4.24	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.70	4.66	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	479/1490	4.41	4.08	4.11	4.19	4.41
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	422/1428	4.79	4.57	4.49	4.54	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	548/1436	4.89	4.77	4.74	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	713/1427	4.44	4.25	4.32	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	667/1425	4.50	4.24	4.34	4.37	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	395/1291	4.44	3.97	4.05	4.10	4.44
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	701/1271	4.17	4.16	4.16	4.33	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.21	4.33	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	637/1273	4.50	4.48	4.38	4.55	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.23	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 486 1
Title:	Survey Sensors & Instru
Instructor:	Rao, Govind

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/208	****	4.33	4.27	4.21	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.42	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.26	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	4.23	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.33	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.57	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.24	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.11	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.00	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 486 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 23
Title: Survey Sensors & Instru		Questionnaires: 21
Instructor: Rao, Govind		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type			Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	2	Major		9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major		12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	13	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0							
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	1							

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 489 1
Title:	Spec Topics Envr Engr
Instructor:	Santarpia,Joshu

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	8	4	3.65	1355/1528	3.65	4.37	4.31	4.39	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1113/1527	4.00	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	830/1333	4.25	4.35	4.34	4.37	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	968/1439	3.89	4.01	4.11	4.20	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	703/1425	4.22	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1266/1526	4.28	4.70	4.66	4.71	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	9	2	3.75	1149/1490	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.19	3.75
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	1065/1428	4.28	4.57	4.49	4.54	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	1148/1436	4.56	4.77	4.74	4.75	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	7	5	3.94	1128/1427	3.94	4.25	4.32	4.37	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1037/1425	4.11	4.24	4.34	4.37	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	275/1291	4.57	3.97	4.05	4.10	4.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1276	****	4.21	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1273	****	4.48	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 489 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 28
Title: Spec Topics Envr Engr		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Santarpia,Joshu		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major		19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major		1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0							
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	2							

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 489 1
Title:	Spec Topics Envr Engr
Instructor:	Ghosh,Upal

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	8	4	3.65	1355/1528	3.65	4.37	4.31	4.39	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1113/1527	4.00	4.23	4.28	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	830/1333	4.25	4.35	4.34	4.37	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	1047/1495	4.00	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	968/1439	3.89	4.01	4.11	4.20	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	703/1425	4.22	4.19	4.12	4.26	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	1050/1508	4.00	4.24	4.18	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1266/1526	4.28	4.70	4.66	4.71	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1490	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.19	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1276	****	4.21	4.33	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1273	****	4.48	4.38	4.55	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.23	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 489 1	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 28
Title: Spec Topics Envr Engr		Questionnaires: 20
Instructor: Ghosh,Upal		

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

	I	0	Other		0
	?	2			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 610 1
Title:	Chem. Eng. Thermodynamic
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	994/1528	4.19	4.37	4.31	4.45	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	3	6	3.81	1273/1527	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.36	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1003/1333	4.00	4.35	4.34	4.39	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	4	3	3.47	1378/1495	3.47	4.11	4.25	4.33	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1081/1439	3.73	4.01	4.11	4.24	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	950/1425	3.93	4.19	4.12	4.28	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1157/1508	3.88	4.24	4.18	4.25	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.70	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1291/1490	3.45	4.08	4.11	4.16	3.45
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1244/1428	3.94	4.57	4.49	4.56	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	1236/1436	4.44	4.77	4.74	4.83	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	6	5	3	3.44	1320/1427	3.44	4.25	4.32	4.36	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	8	2	4	3.38	1331/1425	3.38	4.24	4.34	4.34	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1089/1291	3.42	3.97	4.05	3.99	3.42
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	717/1271	4.14	4.16	4.16	4.27	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	926/1276	4.00	4.21	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	810/1273	4.29	4.48	4.38	4.52	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	316/922	4.33	3.93	4.02	4.00	4.33



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 610 1
Title:	Chem. Eng. Thermodynamic
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	16

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3 D 0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 660 01
Title:	Regulatory Iss Bio
Instructor:	Moreira, Antonio

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	376/1528	4.71	4.37	4.31	4.45	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	550/1527	4.53	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	2	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	564/1333	4.50	4.35	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	544/1495	4.47	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	307/1439	4.59	4.01	4.11	4.24	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	126/1425	4.82	4.19	4.12	4.28	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	191/1508	4.75	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.70	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	722/1490	4.27	4.08	4.11	4.16	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	253/1428	4.90	4.57	4.49	4.56	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	580/1436	4.90	4.77	4.74	4.83	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	283/1427	4.77	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	98/1425	4.89	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	136/1291	4.73	3.97	4.05	3.99	4.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	549/1271	4.40	4.16	4.16	4.27	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	696/1276	4.40	4.21	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	433/1273	4.73	4.48	4.38	4.52	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	844/922	3.13	3.93	4.02	4.00	3.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 660 01
Title:	Regulatory Iss Bio
Instructor:	Moreira, Antonio

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.33	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.56	4.58	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	5	A	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 660 01
Title:	Regulatory Iss Bio
Instructor:	Moreira, Antonio

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	25

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

84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives			2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			1					
				?	10									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 660 01
Title:	Regulatory Iss Bio
Instructor:	Federici,Mary M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	376/1528	4.71	4.37	4.31	4.45	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	550/1527	4.53	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	2	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	564/1333	4.50	4.35	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	544/1495	4.47	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	307/1439	4.59	4.01	4.11	4.24	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	126/1425	4.82	4.19	4.12	4.28	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	191/1508	4.75	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.70	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	579/1490	4.27	4.08	4.11	4.16	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	177/1428	4.90	4.57	4.49	4.56	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	413/1436	4.90	4.77	4.74	4.83	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	283/1427	4.77	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	231/1425	4.89	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	181/1291	4.73	3.97	4.05	3.99	4.73
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	549/1271	4.40	4.16	4.16	4.27	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	696/1276	4.40	4.21	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	433/1273	4.73	4.48	4.38	4.52	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	844/922	3.13	3.93	4.02	4.00	3.13

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 660 01
Title:	Regulatory Iss Bio
Instructor:	Federici, Mary M

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/208	****	4.33	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.50	4.56	4.58	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/43	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.43	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	5	A	12	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 660 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 25
Title: Regulatory Iss Bio		Questionnaires: 25
Instructor: Federici, Mary M		

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

Self Paced														
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		2		**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		1						
				?	10									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 664 01
Title:	QC/QA Biotech Products
Instructor:	Lubiniecki,Anth

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	376/1528	4.70	4.37	4.31	4.45	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	511/1333	4.56	4.35	4.34	4.39	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	657/1495	4.40	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	980/1439	3.88	4.01	4.11	4.24	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.19	4.12	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.70	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	822/1490	4.25	4.08	4.11	4.16	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	735/1428	4.58	4.57	4.49	4.56	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	886/1436	4.89	4.77	4.74	4.83	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	772/1427	4.64	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	966/1425	4.49	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	923/1291	4.00	3.97	4.05	3.99	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	741/1271	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.27	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1276	4.56	4.21	4.33	4.43	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	507/1273	4.67	4.48	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.00	****



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 664 01
Title:	QC/QA Biotech Products
Instructor:	Lubiniecki,Anth

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	7	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 664 01
Title:	QC/QA Biotech Products
Instructor:	Venkat,Krish

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	376/1528	4.70	4.37	4.31	4.45	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.23	4.28	4.36	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	511/1333	4.56	4.35	4.34	4.39	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	657/1495	4.40	4.11	4.25	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	980/1439	3.88	4.01	4.11	4.24	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	396/1425	4.50	4.19	4.12	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.24	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.70	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	530/1490	4.25	4.08	4.11	4.16	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	794/1428	4.58	4.57	4.49	4.56	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1436	4.89	4.77	4.74	4.83	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	156/1427	4.64	4.25	4.32	4.36	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	320/1425	4.49	4.24	4.34	4.34	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	560/1291	4.00	3.97	4.05	3.99	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	741/1271	4.11	4.16	4.16	4.27	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1276	4.56	4.21	4.33	4.43	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	507/1273	4.67	4.48	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/922	****	3.93	4.02	4.00	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 664 01
Title:	QC/QA Biotech Products
Instructor:	Venkat,Krish

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/74	****	****	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	****	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	3.94	3.81	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	7	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						