

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 215 1
Title:	Chem Engineering Analy
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	6	43	4.84	194/1520	4.84	4.46	4.31	4.36	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	14	35	4.71	294/1520	4.71	4.02	4.27	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	4	16	29	4.51	535/1291	4.51	4.19	4.33	4.44	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	5	16	23	4.41	636/1483	4.41	4.20	4.23	4.28	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	16	27	4.38	492/1417	4.38	3.74	4.08	4.14	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	4	15	21	4.43	481/1405	4.43	4.11	4.12	4.13	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	8	11	29	4.39	594/1504	4.39	4.05	4.16	4.15	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	47	4.96	296/1519	4.96	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	1	4	16	20	4.34	556/1495	4.34	3.97	4.11	4.16	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	14	34	4.71	552/1459	4.71	4.42	4.47	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	6	42	4.88	622/1460	4.88	4.72	4.74	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	7	13	27	4.43	736/1455	4.43	4.10	4.32	4.39	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	6	12	29	4.44	756/1456	4.44	4.12	4.34	4.46	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	2	4	9	9	13	3.73	950/1316	3.73	3.88	4.03	4.18	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	9	10	23	4.20	660/1243	4.20	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	16	25	4.45	615/1241	4.45	4.36	4.33	4.38	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	14	25	4.48	671/1236	4.48	4.46	4.40	4.45	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	1	3	8	9	12	3.85	577/889	3.85	4.03	4.02	3.99	3.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 215 1
Title:	Chem Engineering Analy
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	4.90	4.15	4.57	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	4.87	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	48
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 300 1
Title:	Chem Proc Thermodynamics
Instructor:	Castellanos,Mar

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	1	13	21	4.37	802/1520	4.37	4.46	4.31	4.33	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	7	17	11	3.95	1147/1520	3.95	4.02	4.27	4.26	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	16	14	4.19	865/1291	4.19	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	4	7	12	10	3.85	1159/1483	3.85	4.20	4.23	4.25	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	7	8	16	4.06	773/1417	4.06	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	2	6	8	10	4.00	843/1405	4.00	4.11	4.12	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	6	13	14	4.00	999/1504	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	632/1519	4.89	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	4	7	13	7	3.66	1210/1495	3.66	3.97	4.11	4.07	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	10	18	4.41	967/1459	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.47	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	923/1460	4.74	4.72	4.74	4.72	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	5	3	14	8	3.83	1202/1455	3.83	4.10	4.32	4.31	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	7	6	15	4.00	1094/1456	4.00	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	19	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1202/1316	3.10	3.88	4.03	4.08	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	2	9	9	4.05	756/1243	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.16	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	727/1241	4.32	4.36	4.33	4.34	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	865/1236	4.18	4.46	4.40	4.41	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	16	14	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.02	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 300 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 55
Title: Chem Proc Thermodynamics		Questionnaires: 38
Instructor: Castellanos,Mar		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	1	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 425 1
Title:	Transport I:Fluids
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	517/1520	4.57	4.46	4.31	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	884/1520	4.26	4.02	4.27	4.32	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	9	6	4.00	974/1291	4.00	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	713/1483	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	461/1417	4.41	3.74	4.08	4.12	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	385/1405	4.50	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	1	5	10	4.16	859/1504	4.16	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	856/1495	4.06	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	736/1459	4.59	4.42	4.47	4.54	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	753/1460	4.82	4.72	4.74	4.78	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	983/1455	4.18	4.10	4.32	4.37	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1140/1456	3.94	4.12	4.34	4.41	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	1081/1316	3.45	3.88	4.03	4.12	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1243	****	4.01	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1241	****	4.36	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1236	****	4.46	4.40	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 425 1
Title:	Transport I:Fluids
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	53
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 2
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	710/1520	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1311/1520	3.69	4.02	4.27	4.32	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1291	****	4.19	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	349/1483	4.64	4.20	4.23	4.33	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	3	1	0	5	1	3.00	1348/1417	3.00	3.74	4.08	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	433/1405	4.47	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	882/1504	4.13	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	672/1519	4.87	4.79	4.70	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	995/1495	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1132/1459	4.02	4.42	4.47	4.54	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1268/1460	4.53	4.72	4.74	4.78	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1144/1455	3.96	4.10	4.32	4.37	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1189/1456	3.77	4.12	4.34	4.41	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	462/1316	4.33	3.88	4.03	4.12	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	903/1243	3.80	4.01	4.17	4.42	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	666/1241	4.40	4.36	4.33	4.56	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	564/1236	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.64	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 2
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	11/164	4.90	4.90	4.15	4.36	4.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	97/165	4.18	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	93/160	4.45	4.45	4.45	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	75/158	4.55	4.55	4.36	4.49	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	24/150	4.64	4.64	4.05	3.93	4.64
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.60	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.04	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	2.94	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 2
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	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 437L 2
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Enszer,Joshua

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	710/1520	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	3	3.69	1311/1520	3.69	4.02	4.27	4.32	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	12	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1291	****	4.19	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	349/1483	4.64	4.20	4.23	4.33	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	3	1	0	5	1	3.00	1348/1417	3.00	3.74	4.08	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	433/1405	4.47	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	882/1504	4.13	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	672/1519	4.87	4.79	4.70	4.70	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	10	1	3.92	995/1495	3.93	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1312/1459	4.02	4.42	4.47	4.54	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1048/1460	4.53	4.72	4.74	4.78	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1075/1455	3.96	4.10	4.32	4.37	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1265/1456	3.77	4.12	4.34	4.41	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1316	4.33	3.88	4.03	4.12	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	903/1243	3.80	4.01	4.17	4.42	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	666/1241	4.40	4.36	4.33	4.56	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	564/1236	4.60	4.46	4.40	4.64	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 2
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Enszer,Joshua

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	11/164	4.90	4.90	4.15	4.36	4.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	97/165	4.18	4.18	4.19	4.23	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	93/160	4.45	4.45	4.45	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	75/158	4.55	4.55	4.36	4.49	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	24/150	4.64	4.64	4.05	3.93	4.64
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.60	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.04	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	2.94	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 437L 2
Title:	Chemical Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Enszer,Joshua

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	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 444 1
Title:	Process Engineering Econ
Instructor:	Tourgee,Dan E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	11	25	4.65	426/1520	4.65	4.46	4.31	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	9	14	11	3.86	1212/1520	3.86	4.02	4.27	4.32	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	31	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/1291	****	4.19	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	2	5	16	8	3.88	1141/1483	3.88	4.20	4.23	4.33	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	4	12	11	6	3.36	1241/1417	3.36	3.74	4.08	4.12	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	3	8	11	8	3.63	1136/1405	3.63	4.11	4.12	4.25	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	7	4	2	9	14	1	3.20	1409/1504	3.20	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	6	13	18	4.32	1266/1519	4.32	4.79	4.70	4.70	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	7	15	9	3.94	982/1495	3.94	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	7	11	18	4.31	1055/1459	4.31	4.42	4.47	4.54	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	12	22	4.56	1157/1460	4.56	4.72	4.74	4.78	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	7	15	12	4.03	1065/1455	4.03	4.10	4.32	4.37	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	11	21	4.44	746/1456	4.44	4.12	4.34	4.41	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	6	14	13	4.12	659/1316	4.12	3.88	4.03	4.12	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1243	****	4.01	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1241	****	4.36	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	****	4.46	4.40	4.64	****
4. Were special techniques successful	36	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 444 1
Title:	Process Engineering Econ
Instructor:	Tourgee,Dan E

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	39

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	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	4.18	4.19	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	37
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	2
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	2	15	14	4.31	862/1520	4.31	4.46	4.31	4.44	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	10	13	4.20	940/1520	4.20	4.02	4.27	4.32	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	9	19	4.57	483/1291	4.57	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	735/1483	4.32	4.20	4.23	4.33	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	6	5	6	4	3.17	1311/1417	3.17	3.74	4.08	4.12	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	625/1405	4.29	4.11	4.12	4.25	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	10	16	4.32	669/1504	4.32	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	20	6	4.03	1426/1519	4.03	4.79	4.70	4.70	4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	18	5	4.00	891/1495	4.00	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	967/1459	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.54	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	7	18	4.62	1108/1460	4.62	4.72	4.74	4.78	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	6	12	7	3.96	1109/1455	3.96	4.10	4.32	4.37	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	4	5	14	4.15	1021/1456	4.15	4.12	4.34	4.41	4.15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 445 1	Term - Fall 2011	Enrollment: 42
Title: Separation Processes		Questionnaires: 32
Instructor: Frey,Douglas D		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	4	1	8	7	3.90	830/1316	3.90	3.88	4.03	4.12	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	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 482 1
Title:	Biochemical Engineering
Instructor:	Marten,Mark R

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	230/1520	4.80	4.46	4.31	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	443/1520	4.60	4.02	4.27	4.32	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	739/1291	4.36	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	636/1483	4.40	4.20	4.23	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	3	7	3.93	893/1417	3.93	3.74	4.08	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1141/1405	3.62	4.11	4.12	4.25	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	803/1504	4.20	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	956/1519	4.67	4.79	4.70	4.70	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	706/1495	4.21	3.97	4.11	4.21	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	648/1459	4.64	4.42	4.47	4.54	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	435/1460	4.93	4.72	4.74	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	981/1456	4.21	4.12	4.34	4.41	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	729/1316	4.00	3.88	4.03	4.12	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	339/1243	4.60	4.01	4.17	4.42	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.36	4.33	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.46	4.40	4.64	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/164	****	4.90	4.15	4.36	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	4.18	4.19	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/160	****	4.45	4.45	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/158	****	4.55	4.36	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/150	****	4.64	4.05	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.60	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.55	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	****	4.54	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	4.59	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.20	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.04	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.01	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.17	3.99	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.17	3.43	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.07	3.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	17

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	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.06	2.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	3.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	3	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	12	6	3.92	1208/1520	3.92	4.46	4.31	4.44	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	4	5	3.38	1411/1520	3.38	4.02	4.27	4.32	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1151/1291	3.63	4.19	4.33	4.38	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	7	7	4	3.60	1281/1483	3.60	4.20	4.23	4.33	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	3	5	6	2	3.29	1269/1417	3.29	3.74	4.08	4.12	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1198/1405	3.50	4.11	4.12	4.25	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	3	9	4	3	2.96	1443/1504	2.96	4.05	4.16	4.21	2.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	733/1519	4.83	4.79	4.70	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	11	5	3.95	956/1495	3.95	3.97	4.11	4.21	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	10	7	3.92	1278/1459	3.92	4.42	4.47	4.54	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	1012/1460	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.78	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	9	7	3.88	1179/1455	3.88	4.10	4.32	4.37	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	9	8	3.88	1184/1456	3.88	4.12	4.34	4.41	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	5	9	6	3.86	853/1316	3.86	3.88	4.03	4.12	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1243	****	4.01	4.17	4.42	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1241	****	4.36	4.33	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1236	****	4.46	4.40	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	755/1520	4.40	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	1	3.80	1247/1520	3.80	4.02	4.27	4.28	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	782/1291	4.30	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	960/1483	4.10	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	743/1417	4.10	3.74	4.08	4.13	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	961/1405	3.90	4.11	4.12	4.24	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	569/1504	4.40	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	627/1495	4.29	3.97	4.11	4.20	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	712/1459	4.60	4.42	4.47	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	864/1460	4.78	4.72	4.74	4.77	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1319/1455	3.50	4.10	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	1286/1456	3.60	4.12	4.34	4.32	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1030/1316	3.57	3.88	4.03	3.86	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1158/1243	3.20	4.01	4.17	4.23	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1036/1241	3.80	4.36	4.33	4.39	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	947/1236	4.00	4.46	4.40	4.47	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	16
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														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/889	****	4.03	4.02	4.06	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1 A 3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1 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 664 01
Title:	QC/QA Biotech Products
Instructor:	Lubiniecki,Anth

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	755/1520	4.40	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1047/1520	4.07	4.02	4.27	4.28	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	939/1291	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	917/1483	4.14	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	761/1417	4.08	3.74	4.08	4.13	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	625/1405	4.29	4.11	4.12	4.24	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	631/1504	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	1	6	0	3.50	1288/1495	3.69	3.97	4.11	4.20	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	648/1459	4.70	4.42	4.47	4.48	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	981/1460	4.77	4.72	4.74	4.77	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	558/1455	4.74	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	566/1456	4.64	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	668/1316	4.30	3.88	4.03	3.86	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	638/1243	4.23	4.01	4.17	4.23	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	770/1241	4.25	4.36	4.33	4.39	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	717/1236	4.42	4.46	4.40	4.47	4.42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	411/889	4.13	4.03	4.02	4.06	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	7	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	755/1520	4.40	4.46	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1047/1520	4.07	4.02	4.27	4.28	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	939/1291	4.07	4.19	4.33	4.38	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	917/1483	4.14	4.20	4.23	4.25	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	761/1417	4.08	3.74	4.08	4.13	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	625/1405	4.29	4.11	4.12	4.24	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	631/1504	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1045/1495	3.69	3.97	4.11	4.20	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	463/1459	4.70	4.42	4.47	4.48	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	727/1460	4.77	4.72	4.74	4.77	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	146/1455	4.74	4.10	4.32	4.31	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	503/1456	4.64	4.12	4.34	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	312/1316	4.30	3.88	4.03	3.86	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	638/1243	4.23	4.01	4.17	4.23	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	770/1241	4.25	4.36	4.33	4.39	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	717/1236	4.42	4.46	4.40	4.47	4.42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	411/889	4.13	4.03	4.02	4.06	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	7	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	6						