

Course-Section: ENCH 225 0101
 Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING
 Instructor: ROSS, JULIA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 671
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	9	11	4.12	1150/1670	4.12	4.46	4.31	4.32	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	13	4.35	858/1666	4.35	4.34	4.27	4.27	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	644/1406	4.46	4.52	4.32	4.39	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	8	12	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.21	4.24	4.29	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	2	6	6	4	3.18	1434/1566	3.18	3.85	4.07	4.00	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	823/1528	4.12	4.16	4.12	4.11	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	5	16	4.35	794/1650	4.35	3.94	4.22	4.20	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	5	4.19	1409/1667	4.19	4.52	4.67	4.64	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	11	3	3.68	1300/1626	3.68	4.18	4.11	4.06	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	11	12	4.32	1102/1559	4.32	4.40	4.46	4.40	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	929/1560	4.76	4.74	4.72	4.73	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	994/1549	4.24	4.31	4.31	4.25	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	7	12	4.16	1056/1546	4.16	4.26	4.32	4.30	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1149/1323	3.18	3.94	4.00	4.08	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/1384	****	3.70	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.07	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1378	****	4.27	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	3	4	5	10	4.00	147/ 232	4.00	4.42	4.19	4.35	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	2	7	4	7	3.55	213/ 239	3.55	4.43	4.21	4.33	3.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	89/ 230	4.68	4.81	4.44	4.61	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	146/ 231	4.18	4.56	4.31	4.52	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	3	3	4	11	3.95	155/ 218	3.95	4.40	4.18	4.25	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 427 0101
 Title TRANS PROC II:MASS TRA
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 672
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	7	21	4.44	765/1670	4.44	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	16	12	4.19	1048/1666	4.19	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	13	12	4.03	1039/1406	4.03	4.52	4.32	4.48	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	7	10	10	3.81	1294/1615	3.81	4.21	4.24	4.37	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	7	12	7	3.58	1241/1566	3.58	3.85	4.07	4.17	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	7	5	8	8	3.28	1391/1528	3.28	4.16	4.12	4.26	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	794/1650	4.34	3.94	4.22	4.28	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	805/1667	4.84	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	1004/1560	4.72	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	8	17	4.34	888/1549	4.34	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	9	18	4.45	795/1546	4.45	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	16	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	820/1323	3.90	3.94	4.00	4.10	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	7	1	2	3	3	2.63	1325/1384	2.63	3.70	4.10	4.32	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	3	2	1	7	3.53	1181/1378	3.53	4.07	4.29	4.55	3.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	1067/1378	3.87	4.27	4.31	4.60	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	17	11	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENCH 440 0101
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING KINET
 Instructor: MARTEN, MARK
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 673
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	403/1666	4.68	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	411/1406	4.68	4.52	4.32	4.48	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	619/1615	4.46	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	16	4.36	530/1566	4.36	3.85	4.07	4.17	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	8	6	8	3.68	1396/1650	3.68	3.94	4.22	4.28	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1256/1667	4.40	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	681/1626	4.29	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	959/1559	4.46	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	873/1560	4.79	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	2	16	4.42	835/1546	4.42	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	3	4	6	6	3.65	965/1323	3.65	3.94	4.00	4.10	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	550/1384	4.39	3.70	4.10	4.32	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	327/1378	4.83	4.07	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	590/1378	4.61	4.27	4.31	4.60	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	384/ 904	4.24	4.24	4.03	4.22	4.24

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	22				
				? 2						

Course-Section: ENCH 441 0101
 Title RXN KINETICS IN BIOENG
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 674
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.52	4.32	4.48	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	412/1615	4.64	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	0	1	6	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.85	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	0	7	4.09	1084/1650	4.09	3.94	4.22	4.28	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	842/1667	4.82	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	371/1626	4.55	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	451/1549	4.70	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	482/1546	4.70	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	3.94	4.00	4.10	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.70	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.07	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.42	4.19	4.35	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.26	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 230	5.00	4.81	4.44	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	4.56	4.31	4.24	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 218	5.00	4.40	4.18	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENCH 442 0101
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING SYS A
 Instructor: SMITH, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 675
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	846/1666	4.35	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.52	4.32	4.48	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	800/1615	4.32	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	5	2	3	3.07	1467/1566	3.07	3.85	4.07	4.17	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	805/1528	4.14	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	1020/1650	4.16	3.94	4.22	4.28	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	3	0	0	1	15	4.32	1326/1667	4.32	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	12	3	4.06	926/1626	4.06	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	933/1559	4.47	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	803/1560	4.82	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	470/1546	4.71	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	980/1323	3.63	3.94	4.00	4.10	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	3.70	4.10	4.32	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.07	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.27	4.31	4.60	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 446 0101
 Title PROC ENGINEERING ECON
 Instructor: CASTELLANOS, MA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 676
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	13	4.21	1027/1666	4.21	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	0	0	7	6	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.52	4.32	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1098/1566	3.82	3.85	4.07	4.17	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	688/1528	4.27	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	4	10	6	3.78	1341/1650	3.78	3.94	4.22	4.28	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	946/1667	4.74	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	339/1626	4.58	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	10	8	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	1126/1560	4.63	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	1053/1549	4.17	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	0	9	6	3.89	1240/1546	3.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	2	0	0	7	4	3.85	864/1323	3.85	3.94	4.00	4.10	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	962/1384	3.83	3.70	4.10	4.32	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.07	4.29	4.55	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.27	4.31	4.60	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.42	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.43	4.21	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 5	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 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 450 0101
 Title CHEM PROCESS DEVELOPME
 Instructor: RUDESILL, JOHN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 677
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	516/1666	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.52	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	467/1615	4.58	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	621/1566	4.27	3.85	4.07	4.17	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1528	4.42	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	806/1650	4.33	3.94	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	808/1626	4.18	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	572/1559	4.73	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	410/1549	4.73	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	782/1546	4.45	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	299/1323	4.56	3.94	4.00	4.10	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	3.70	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.07	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.27	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5	
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		7
			? 0			

Course-Section: ENCH 459 0101
 Title STAT DESIGN EXPERIMENT
 Instructor: LOEHE, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 678
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1564/1666	3.33	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.52	4.32	4.48	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1448/1615	3.50	4.21	4.24	4.37	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.85	4.07	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	3.94	4.22	4.28	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.18	4.11	4.28	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.74	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	4.31	4.31	4.43	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1425/1546	3.33	4.26	4.32	4.43	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.94	4.00	4.10	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	3.70	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1378	****	4.07	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.27	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 484 0101
 Title BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING
 Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 679
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1017/1670	4.23	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1403/1666	3.77	4.34	4.27	4.35	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1276/1615	3.83	4.21	4.24	4.37	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	808/1566	4.08	3.85	4.07	4.17	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	580/1528	4.38	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1090/1650	4.08	3.94	4.22	4.28	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	3	0	0	0	7	3.80	1625/1667	3.80	4.52	4.67	4.73	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1376/1560	4.33	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	2	1	2.89	1498/1546	2.89	4.26	4.32	4.43	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1161/1323	3.14	3.94	4.00	4.10	3.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 485L 0101
 Title BIOCHEM ENGINEERING LA
 Instructor: RAO, GOVIND
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 680
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	3.85	4.07	4.17	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1063/1528	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.26	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	3.94	4.22	4.28	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1408/1559	3.75	4.40	4.46	4.58	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.94	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	3.70	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.07	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.27	4.31	4.60	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	115/ 232	4.25	4.42	4.19	4.35	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	48/ 239	4.75	4.43	4.21	4.26	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	74/ 230	4.75	4.81	4.44	4.30	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	114/ 231	4.50	4.56	4.31	4.24	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	115/ 218	4.25	4.40	4.18	4.09	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 489R 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN ENVR EN
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 681
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.46	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.21	4.24	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	559/1566	4.33	3.85	4.07	4.17	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.16	4.12	4.26	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	806/1650	4.33	3.94	4.22	4.28	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.52	4.67	4.73	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.18	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.40	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.74	4.72	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.43	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.94	4.00	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 630 0101
 Title TRANSPORT PHENOMENA
 Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 682
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.46	4.31	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	378/1666	4.70	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.21	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1029/1566	3.89	3.85	4.07	4.20	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	733/1528	4.22	4.16	4.12	4.33	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	3.94	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1256/1667	4.40	4.52	4.67	4.74	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	255/1626	4.70	4.18	4.11	4.20	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.89	4.40	4.46	4.49	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.74	4.72	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	220/1549	4.89	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.78	4.26	4.32	4.40	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	626/1323	4.14	3.94	4.00	4.03	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1057/1384	3.60	3.70	4.10	4.21	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1275/1378	3.20	4.07	4.29	4.42	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1086/1378	3.80	4.27	4.31	4.51	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 640 0101
 Title ADV CHEM REACTN KINETI
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 683
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	632/1670	4.54	4.46	4.31	4.46	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	908/1666	4.31	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	739/1406	4.38	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	712/1615	4.38	4.21	4.24	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1263/1566	3.55	3.85	4.07	4.20	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1528	4.58	4.16	4.12	4.33	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	3.94	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.52	4.67	4.74	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	704/1626	4.27	4.18	4.11	4.20	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1450/1559	3.58	4.40	4.46	4.49	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.74	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	1308/1549	3.75	4.31	4.31	4.37	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.26	4.32	4.40	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	597/1323	4.18	3.94	4.00	4.03	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.70	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	842/1378	4.29	4.07	4.29	4.42	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	608/1378	4.57	4.27	4.31	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	1071/1670	4.19	4.46	4.31	4.46	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	1048/1666	4.19	4.34	4.27	4.34	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	3	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.52	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1288/1615	3.81	4.21	4.24	4.33	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	851/1566	4.00	3.85	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.16	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	1101/1650	4.06	3.94	4.22	4.30	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.52	4.67	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	915/1626	4.07	4.18	4.11	4.20	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	640/1559	4.69	4.40	4.46	4.49	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.74	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	816/1549	4.40	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	808/1546	4.44	4.26	4.32	4.40	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	670/1323	4.07	3.94	4.00	4.03	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	5	4	3	3.19	1223/1384	3.19	3.70	4.10	4.21	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	5	2	5	3.38	1236/1378	3.38	4.07	4.29	4.42	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	1031/1378	3.94	4.27	4.31	4.51	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.24	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.42	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 239	****	4.43	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.81	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.56	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 218	****	4.40	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 87	****	****	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 79	****	****	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 75	****	****	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 79	****	****	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 80	****	****	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: ENCH 662 8020
 Title GMP'S FOR BIOPROCESSES
 Instructor: MOREIRA, ANTONI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 684
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	8	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	16	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						