```
Course-Section: ENCH 225  0101              University of Maryland                              Page  657
Title           CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING        Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:     ROSS, JULIA                  Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      22
Questionnaires:  22                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                               Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   2   5  15  4.59   513/1576   4.55  4.49  4.30  4.35  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   4  18  4.82   215/1576   4.75  4.44  4.27  4.32  4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   3  19  4.86   203/1342   4.84  4.37  4.32  4.41  4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   1   1   6  14  4.50   511/1520   4.56  4.38  4.25  4.26  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1   0   0   8   6   7  3.95   919/1465   3.81  4.06  4.12  4.09  3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   5   6  10  4.14   806/1434   4.35  4.30  4.14  4.06  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   6  16  4.73   270/1547   4.64  4.20  4.19  4.22  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   4  17  4.81   665/1574   4.75  4.58  4.64  4.62  4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0   0   0  10  11  4.52   379/1554   4.30  4.15  4.10  4.05  4.52

             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   5  15  4.75   505/1488   4.88  4.58  4.47  4.44  4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   7  13  4.65  1065/1493   4.69  4.82  4.73  4.75  4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   0  10  10  4.50   678/1486   4.58  4.32  4.32  4.29  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   0   2  18  4.90   194/1489   4.78  4.31  4.32  4.31  4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 7  0   2   3   3   5  3.85   834/1277   3.26  3.64  4.03  4.01  3.85

             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0  0   0   1   3   3  4.29   641/1279   4.29  3.95  4.17  4.14  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0  0   0   1   1   5  4.57   582/1270   4.64  4.26  4.35  4.30  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0  0   0   3   4  4.57   602/1269   4.64  4.10  4.35  4.29  4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   0   0   0   0   4   3  4.43   270/ 878   4.38  4.18  4.05  3.92  4.43

             Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10   0   0   0   1   5   6  4.42   102/ 234   4.29  4.53  4.23  4.44  4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0  1   2   4   5  4.08   190/ 240   3.54  3.86  4.35  4.47  4.08
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0  0   0   4   8  4.67    93/ 229   4.73  4.82  4.51  4.65  4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           10   1   0   0   4   2   5  4.09   158/ 232   3.65  4.10  4.29  4.38  4.09
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10   0   0   0   0   3   9  4.75    44/ 379   4.48  4.32  4.20  4.29  4.75

             Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21   0   1   0   0   0   0  1.00  ****/  52   ****  ****  4.48  4.74  ****


                                         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        22
28-55        3         1.00-1.99    0     B    9                                     
56-83       12         2.00-2.99    6     C    5         General               0     Under-grad   22        Non-major     0
84-150       0         3.00-3.49    4     D    0
Grad.        0         3.50-4.00    2     F    0         Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0         Other                21
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 225  0201                      University of Maryland                                           Page  658
Title           CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING                 Baltimore County                                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:     ROSS, JULIA                              Spring 2009                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      21
Questionnaires:  16                             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                                  Frequencies            Instructor      Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                     NR  NA   1   2   3   4   5  Mean     Rank      Mean   Mean  Mean Mean Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0   0   0   1   6   9  4.50   637/1576   4.55   4.49  4.30 4.35 4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   0   5  11  4.69   364/1576   4.75   4.44  4.27 4.32 4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   3  13  4.81   233/1342   4.84   4.37  4.32 4.41 4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   4  11  4.63   376/1520   4.56   4.38  4.25 4.26 4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   2   2   1   4   6  3.67  1166/1465   3.81   4.06  4.12 4.09 3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   2   3  11  4.56   353/1434   4.35   4.30  4.14 4.06 4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   1   5  10  4.56   457/1547   4.64   4.20  4.19 4.22 4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   5  11  4.69   881/1574   4.75   4.58  4.64 4.62 4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0   1   0   1   8   5  4.07   892/1554   4.30   4.15  4.10 4.05 4.07


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   0   0   0   0  15  5.00     1/1488   4.88   4.58  4.47 4.44 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   4  11  4.73   947/1493   4.69   4.82  4.73 4.75 4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0   0   0   1   3  11  4.67   468/1486   4.58   4.32  4.32 4.29 4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   0   5  10  4.67   500/1489   4.78   4.31  4.32 4.31 4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  8   3   0   0   2   1  2.67  1219/1277   3.26   3.64  4.03 4.01 2.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0   1   0   0   1   5  4.29   641/1279   4.29   3.95  4.17 4.14 4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   458/1270   4.64   4.26  4.35 4.30 4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0   0   1   0   6  4.71   491/1269   4.64   4.10  4.35 4.29 4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   1   0   1   0   1   4  4.33   322/ 878   4.38   4.18  4.05 3.92 4.33


            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  10   0   0   0   0   5   1  4.17   144/ 234   4.29   4.53  4.23 4.44 4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0  0   2   3   0   1  3.00   234/ 240   3.54   3.86  4.35 4.47 3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11 0  0   0   0   1   4  4.80    54/ 229   4.73   4.82  4.51 4.65 4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0   1   0   2   1   1  3.20   216/ 232   3.65   4.10  4.29 4.38 3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0   0   0   1   2   2  4.20   175/ 379   4.48   4.32  4.20 4.29 4.20


                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0          A    8        Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0        Major       15
 28-55      1        1.00-1.99    0          B    7
 56-83     10        2.00-2.99    1          C    0        General               0     Under-grad   16        Non-major    1
 84-150     1        3.00-3.49    4          D    0
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    8          F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                             P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                             I    0        Other                16
                                             ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 427  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  659
Title        TRANS PROC II:MASS TRA        Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  BAYLES, TARYN                 Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires:  21                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                            Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
                 Questions                NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0  0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86  203/1576  4.86 4.49  4.30 4.46 4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  7 14  4.67  392/1576  4.67 4.44  4.27 4.35 4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  7 14  4.67  406/1342  4.67 4.37  4.32 4.46 4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  1  1  6 13  4.48  562/1520  4.48 4.38  4.25 4.38 4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  3  1  6 11  4.19  708/1465  4.19 4.06  4.12 4.22 4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  1  3  7  9  4.05  861/1434  4.05 4.30  4.14 4.30 4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  4 17  4.81  186/1547  4.81 4.20  4.19 4.24 4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0 13  8  4.38 1219/1574  4.38 4.58  4.64 4.69 4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0  0  1  6 13  4.60  316/1554  4.60 4.15  4.10 4.24 4.60

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1  0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  149/1488  4.95 4.58  4.47 4.55 4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  2  1 17  4.75  908/1493  4.75 4.82  4.73 4.80 4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  5 14  4.65  484/1486  4.65 4.32  4.32 4.41 4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1  0  0  0  0  4 16  4.80  309/1489  4.80 4.31  4.32 4.38 4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 12 1  0  1  1  5  4.13  638/1277  4.13 3.64  4.03 4.04 4.13

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  3  2  7  1  0  2.46 1254/1279  2.46 3.95  4.17 4.31 2.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  5  0  4  1  2  2.58 1246/1270  2.58 4.26  4.35 4.53 2.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 3  1  3  1  3  3.00 1210/1269  3.00 4.10  4.35 4.55 3.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   10 9  0  0  2  0  0  3.00 ****/ 878  **** 4.18  4.05 4.33 ****

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0          A    4      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major      21
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0          B    9                                                       
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99   2          C    5      General               0      Under-grad   21      Non-major   0
 84-150    10      3.00-3.49   4          D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   6          F    0      Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                18
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 440  0101            University of Maryland                            Page  660
Title       CHEM ENGINEERING KINET          Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    GOOD, THERESA                   Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    28
Questionnaires: 22                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies       Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0  0  0  0  4  6 12  4.36  829/1576   4.36  4.49  4.30  4.46  4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  1  3  8 10  4.23  968/1576   4.23  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  5  6 11  4.27  819/1342   4.27  4.37  4.32  4.46  4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  7  0  2  2  5  6  4.00 1041/1520   4.00  4.38  4.25  4.38  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  5  1  1  2  3 10  4.18  728/1465   4.18  4.06  4.12  4.22  4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 2 0 3 5 6  3.81 1057/1434   3.81  4.30  4.14  4.30  3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  1  0  0  4  8  9  4.24  860/1547   4.24  4.20  4.19  4.24  4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  1 16  5  4.18 1373/1574   4.18  4.58  4.64  4.69  4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 11 3  4.13  838/1554   4.13  4.15  4.10  4.24  4.13


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  6 10  6  4.00 1233/1488   4.00  4.58  4.47  4.55  4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  4 18  4.82  784/1493   4.82  4.82  4.73  4.80  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1 10  9  1  3.48 1339/1486   3.48  4.32  4.32  4.41  3.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  3 10  8  4.14 1042/1489   4.14  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 13 2 1  1  3  1  3.00 1149/1277   3.00  3.64  4.03  4.04  3.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/1279   ****  3.95  4.17  4.31  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 20 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/1270   ****  4.26  4.35  4.53  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 20 0 0 0 0 0 2  5.00 ****/1269   ****  4.10  4.35  4.55  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  19  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 878   ****  4.18  4.05  4.33  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons              Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0        A  10      Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0       Major       22
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0        B   4                                Under-grad   22       Non-major    0
 56-83      0      2.00-2.99    4        C   4      General              0    Under-grad   22       Non-major    0
 84-150    13      3.00-3.49    5        D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6        F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                               responses to be significant
                                         I   0      Other               20
                                         ?   3
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 441  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 661
Title        RXN KINETICS IN BIOENG        Baltimore County                                        JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  GOOD, THERESA                 Spring 2009                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  637/1576  4.50  4.49  4.30  4.46  4.50
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  201/1576  4.83  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.83
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  298/1342  4.75  4.37  4.32  4.46  4.75
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  179/1520  4.83  4.38  4.25  4.38  4.83
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00  1/1465    5.00  4.06  4.12  4.22  5.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  138/1434  4.83  4.30  4.14  4.30  4.83
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  924/1547  4.17  4.20  4.19  4.24  4.17
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00  1/1574    5.00  4.58  4.64  4.69  5.00
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  1  4  1  4.00  924/1554  4.00  4.15  4.10  4.24  4.00

              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00  1/1488    5.00  4.58  4.47  4.55  5.00
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00  1/1493    5.00  4.82  4.73  4.80  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  468/1486  4.67  4.32  4.32  4.41  4.67
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  274/1489  4.83  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.83
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  3  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  692/1277  4.00  3.64  4.03  4.04  4.00

              Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   4   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 234    5.00  4.53  4.23  4.28  5.00
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  91/ 240   4.50  3.86  4.35  4.45  4.50
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 229    5.00  4.82  4.51  4.70  5.00
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            4   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00  1/ 232    5.00  4.10  4.29  4.56  5.00
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  4   0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00  229/ 379  4.00  4.32  4.20  4.19  4.00


                                     Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 442  0101            University of Maryland                              Page  662
Title         CHEM ENGINEERING SYS A       Baltimore County                                  JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   SMITH, JEFFREY               Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      23
Questionnaires:  18                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  5 12  4.61  485/1576   4.61  4.49  4.30  4.46  4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  313/1576   4.72  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  406/1342   4.67  4.37  4.32  4.46  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   3  0  0  2  2 11  4.60  395/1520   4.60  4.38  4.25  4.38  4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  1  0  4  4  5  3.86 1028/1465   3.86  4.06  4.12  4.22  3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8  0  0  2  3  4  4.22  716/1434   4.22  4.30  4.14  4.30  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61  399/1547   4.61  4.20  4.19  4.24  4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  2 16  4.89  508/1574   4.89  4.58  4.64  4.69  4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  0  0  2  8  3  4.08  886/1554   4.08  4.15  4.10  4.24  4.08


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  0  0 16  5.00    1/1488   5.00  4.58  4.47  4.55  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94  390/1493   4.94  4.82  4.73  4.80  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  1  5 10  4.56  607/1486   4.56  4.32  4.32  4.41  4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  2 14  4.88  228/1489   4.88  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 10 0  0  1  1  3  4.40  404/1277   4.40  3.64  4.03  4.04  4.40


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1279   ****  3.95  4.17  4.31  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1270   ****  4.26  4.35  4.53  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1269   ****  4.10  4.35  4.55  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 878   ****  4.18  4.05  4.33  ****


                                   Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     2      0.00-0.99   0        A    8       Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0     Major       18
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0        B    7
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99   0        C    1       General               0    Under-grad   18     Non-major    0
  84-150    9      3.00-3.49   3        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   6        F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                16
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 446  0101            University of Maryland                        Page  663
Title        PROC ENGINEERING ECON          Baltimore County                          JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  CASTELLANOS, MA                  Spring 2009                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    23
Questionnaires: 22                   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions          NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  1  2  6  13  4.41  787/1576   4.41  4.49  4.30  4.46  4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  6  7   8  4.10 1082/1576   4.10  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14  0  2  2  3   1  3.38 1252/1342   3.38  4.37  4.32  4.46  3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  7  12  4.41  683/1520   4.41  4.38  4.25  4.38  4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  9  2  2  2  4   2  3.17 1355/1465   3.17  4.06  4.12  4.22  3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 1  5  6   8  4.05  857/1434   4.05  4.30  4.14  4.30  4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  4  3  3  6   5  3.24 1416/1547   3.24  4.20  4.19  4.24  3.24
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  4  6  11  4.33 1262/1574   4.33  4.58  4.64  4.69  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 1  1  7  13  4.45  463/1554   4.45  4.15  4.10  4.24  4.45


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  2  3  5  4   4  3.28 1426/1488   3.28  4.58  4.47  4.55  3.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  0  0  0  4  15  4.79  849/1493   4.79  4.82  4.73  4.80  4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  1  2  5  6   5  3.63 1296/1486   3.63  4.32  4.32  4.41  3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  2  5  6  4   2  2.95 1430/1489   2.95  4.31  4.32  4.38  2.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4  3  3  1  3   5  3.27 1104/1277   3.27  3.64  4.03  4.04  3.27


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0  0  0  2  4   2  4.00  802/1279   4.00  3.95  4.17  4.31  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0  0  0  0  2   6  4.75  412/1270   4.75  4.26  4.35  4.53  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 1 0  0  3   4  4.13  894/1269   4.13  4.10  4.35  4.55  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                 15   0  0  0  1  4   2  4.14  425/ 878   4.14  4.18  4.05  4.33  4.14

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19 0  0  0  0  2   1  4.33 ****/ 379   ****  4.32  4.20  4.19  ****


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      2      0.00-0.99   0      A    8       Required for Majors   0    Graduate      0      Major       20
28-55      0      1.00-1.99   0      B   11
56-83      0      2.00-2.99   3      C    0       General               0    Under-grad   22      Non-major    2
84-150    10      3.00-3.49   6      D    0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   7      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                     I    0       Other                18
                                     ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 450  0101              University of Maryland                          Page  664
Title       CHEM PROCESS DEVELOPME          Baltimore County                                JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  RUDESILL, JOHN                 Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    15
Questionnaires:  11                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies         Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  582/1576  4.55  4.49  4.30  4.46  4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  6  5  4.45  683/1576  4.45  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  443/1342  4.64  4.37  4.32  4.46  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  597/1520  4.45  4.38  4.25  4.38  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  0  1  0  6  3  4.10  798/1465  4.10  4.06  4.12  4.22  4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  4  5  4.27  659/1434  4.27  4.30  4.14  4.30  4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  375/1547  4.64  4.20  4.19  4.24  4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  469/1574  4.91  4.58  4.64  4.69  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  1  5  3  4.22  742/1554  4.22  4.15  4.10  4.24  4.22


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  1  0  9  4.80  401/1488  4.80  4.58  4.47  4.55  4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.82  4.73  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  4  6  4.60  561/1486  4.60  4.32  4.32  4.41  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  461/1489  4.70  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  1  1  0  4  3  3.78  876/1277  3.78  3.64  4.03  4.04  3.78


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83  926/1279  3.83  3.95  4.17  4.31  3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  505/1270  4.67  4.26  4.35  4.53  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  644/1269  4.50  4.10  4.35  4.55  4.50
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   4  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.18  4.05  4.33  ****


                                    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     1     Major        8
 28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0         B    5                                                       
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99   1         C    0          General              4    Under-grad  10     Non-major    3
 84-150     6        3.00-3.49   5         D    0
 Grad.      1        3.50-4.00   1         F    0          Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0          Other                5
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 459  0101            University of Maryland                         Page  665
Title          STAT DESIGN EXPERIMENT      Baltimore County                            JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    LOEHE, JOSEPH               Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       8
Questionnaires:   6              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  1  0  4  4.00 1148/1576  4.00  4.49  4.30  4.46  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83 1275/1576  3.83  4.44  4.27  4.35  3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  3  1  3.67 1166/1342  3.67  4.37  4.32  4.46  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  1  0  1  2  1  3.40 1400/1520  3.40  4.38  4.25  4.38  3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  1  2  0  2  1  3.00 1386/1465  3.00  4.06  4.12  4.22  3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  777/1434  4.17  4.30  4.14  4.30  4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  2  3  1  3.83 1196/1547  3.83  4.20  4.19  4.24  3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.58  4.64  4.69  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1227/1554  3.67  4.15  4.10  4.24  3.67


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  750/1488  4.60  4.58  4.47  4.55  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60 1125/1493  4.60  4.82  4.73  4.80  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  2  0  1  2  3.60 1307/1486  3.60  4.32  4.32  4.41  3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  1  1  1  0  2  3.20 1392/1489  3.20  4.31  4.32  4.38  3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  2  1  1  0  0  1.75 1272/1277  1.75  3.64  4.03  4.04  1.75


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  1  2  0  3.67 1000/1279  3.67  3.95  4.17  4.31  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  928/1270  4.00  4.26  4.35  4.53  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1067/1269  3.67  4.10  4.35  4.55  3.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   2  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.18  4.05  4.33  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 484 0101
University of Maryland
Page 666
Title   BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING
Baltimore County
JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE
Spring 2009
Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                              Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
           Questions                  NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank     Mean  Mean Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
           General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0  0  0  3  3  7  4.31  893/1576  4.31  4.49 4.30 4.46  4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  2  9  4.54  568/1576  4.54  4.44 4.27 4.35  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   5  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  583/1342  4.50  4.37 4.32 4.46  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  5  8  4.62  385/1520  4.62  4.38 4.25 4.38  4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  3  9  4.62  297/1465  4.62  4.06 4.12 4.22  4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 1 8  4.31  625/1434  4.31  4.30 4.14 4.30  4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  1  0 12  4.85  160/1547  4.85  4.20 4.19 4.24  4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  1  1  7  4  4.08 1434/1574  4.08  4.58 4.64 4.69  4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 4 5 3  3.92 1046/1554  3.92  4.15 4.10 4.24  3.92

           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  1  3  8  4.58  774/1488  4.58  4.58 4.47 4.55  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83  734/1493  4.83  4.82 4.73 4.80  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 1 4 7  4.50  678/1486  4.50  4.32 4.32 4.41  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  1  4  0  7  4.08 1075/1489  4.08  4.31 4.32 4.38  4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 1 4 6  4.17  608/1277  4.17  3.64 4.03 4.04  4.17

           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80  219/1279  4.80  3.95 4.17 4.31  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 0 5  5.00    1/1270  5.00  4.26 4.35 4.53  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80  386/1269  4.80  4.10 4.35 4.55  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 8   2  0  0  0  0  3  5.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.18 4.05 4.33  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 485L 0101            University of Maryland                          Page  667
Title       BIOCHEM ENGINEERING LA          Baltimore County                             JUL  2, 2009
Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS                      Spring 2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  9                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                  Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                      NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  1  0  1  2  5  4.11 1081/1576  4.11  4.49  4.30 4.46  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  2  5  1  3.67 1345/1576  3.67  4.44  4.27 4.35  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  0  2  2  0  3.50 1209/1342  3.50  4.37  4.32 4.46  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0  0  0  1  4  3  4.25  859/1520  4.25  4.38  4.25 4.38  4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1  1  0  3  3  1  3.38 1302/1465  3.38  4.06  4.12 4.22  3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  2  2  4  3.89 1015/1434  3.89  4.30  4.14 4.30  3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   3  1  2  1  1  1  2.83 1493/1547  2.83  4.20  4.19 4.24  2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  1  0  0  1  7  4.44 1152/1574  4.44  4.58  4.64 4.69  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  1  5  3  4.22  742/1554  4.22  4.15  4.10 4.24  4.22

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  970/1488  4.43  4.58  4.47 4.55  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  986/1493  4.71  4.82  4.73 4.80  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  241/1486  4.83  4.32  4.32 4.41  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  2  1  1  3  3.71 1270/1489  3.71  4.31  4.32 4.38  3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  1  0  0  1  2  2  4.20  585/1277  4.20  3.64  4.03 4.04  4.20

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  335/1279  4.67  3.95  4.17 4.31  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  505/1270  4.67  4.26  4.35 4.53  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1067/1269  3.67  4.10  4.35 4.55  3.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   0  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  464/ 878  4.00  4.18  4.05 4.33  4.00

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   8   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 234  ****  4.53  4.23 4.28  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 240  ****  3.86  4.35 4.45  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 229  ****  4.82  4.51 4.70  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            8   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  4.10  4.29 4.56  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  8   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 379  ****  4.32  4.20 4.19  ****

                              Frequency Distribution
```

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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 489R 0101              University of Maryland                        Page  668
Title       SPEC TOPICS IN ENVR EN           Baltimore County                           JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  GHOSH, UPAL                      Spring 2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      9
Questionnaires:  9                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                       Frequencies      Instructor  Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   2  0  0  0  0  4  3  4.43  757/1576  4.43  4.49  4.30  4.46  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14 1040/1576  4.14  4.44  4.27  4.35  4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29  812/1342  4.29  4.37  4.32  4.46  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  1  0  0  1  4  1  4.00 1041/1520  4.00  4.38  4.25  4.38  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  4  0  0  1  1  1  4.00  850/1465  4.00  4.06  4.12  4.22  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  3  2  2  3.86 1033/1434  3.86  4.30  4.14  4.30  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2  0  1  1  0  3  2  3.57 1316/1547  3.57  4.20  4.19  4.24  3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  832/1574  4.71  4.58  4.64  4.69  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  1  5  0  3.83 1110/1554  3.83  4.15  4.10  4.24  3.83


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  5  2  4.29 1087/1488  4.29  4.58  4.47  4.55  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  986/1493  4.71  4.82  4.73  4.80  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  5  1  4.00 1101/1486  4.00  4.32  4.32  4.41  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  614/1489  4.57  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  0  1  2  3  0  3.33 1086/1277  3.33  3.64  4.03  4.04  3.33


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  1  0  1  4.00 ****/1279  ****  3.95  4.17  4.31  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00 ****/1270  ****  4.26  4.35  4.53  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/1269  ****  4.10  4.35  4.55  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.18  4.05  4.33  ****


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.72  4.77  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.69  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  72  ****  ****  4.64  4.64  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.61  4.52  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 375  ****  ****  4.01  3.90  ****


             Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  4.60  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83  5.00  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.67  5.00  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       8  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.78  5.00  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     8  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 382  ****  ****  5.00  4.08  3.88  ****


                              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    1    Major       5
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0       B   1
  56-83    0        2.00-2.99   1       C   0         General          4    Under-grad  8    Non-major   4
  84-150   2        3.00-3.49   1       D   0
  Grad.    1        3.50-4.00   2       F   0         Electives        0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   1                              responses to be significant
                                        I   0         Other            2
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 630  0101          University of Maryland                                    Page  669
Title          TRANSPORT PHENOMENA      Baltimore County                                          JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    FREY, DOUGLAS            Spring 2009                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires: 7                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions              NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  916/1576  4.29  4.49  4.30  4.43  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  324/1576  4.71  4.44  4.27  4.32  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  345/1342  4.71  4.37  4.32  4.38  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  429/1520  4.57  4.38  4.25  4.36  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  3  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  206/1465  4.75  4.06  4.12  4.25  4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  138/1434  4.83  4.30  4.14  4.35  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  445/1547  4.57  4.20  4.19  4.24  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  4  3  0  3.43 1561/1574  3.43  4.58  4.64  4.75  3.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  623/1554  4.33  4.15  4.10  4.18  4.33

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  324/1488  4.86  4.58  4.47  4.52  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.82  4.73  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  596/1486  4.57  4.32  4.32  4.37  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  934/1489  4.29  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00  692/1277  4.00  3.64  4.03  4.08  4.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  1  0  0  2  3.25 1146/1279  3.25  3.95  4.17  4.34  3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75 1054/1270  3.75  4.26  4.35  4.53  3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  1  0  1  0  2  3.50 1116/1269  3.50  4.10  4.35  4.55  3.50
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   3  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 878  ****  4.18  4.05  4.11  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: ENCH 640  0101            University of Maryland                           Page  670
Title       ADV CHEM REACTN KINETI         Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  GOOD, THERESA                    Spring 2009                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  6                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  219/1576  4.83  4.49  4.30  4.43  4.83
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  392/1576  4.67  4.44  4.27  4.32  4.67
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  1  3  4.17  899/1342  4.17  4.37  4.32  4.38  4.17
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  511/1520  4.50  4.38  4.25  4.36  4.50
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  366/1465  4.50  4.06  4.12  4.25  4.50
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.30  4.14  4.35  4.50
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  4  1  1  3.50 1347/1547  3.50  4.20  4.19  4.24  3.50
 8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50 1079/1574  4.50  4.58  4.64  4.75  4.50
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  395/1554  4.50  4.15  4.10  4.18  4.50


              Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  870/1488  4.50  4.58  4.47  4.52  4.50
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.82  4.73  4.80  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00 1101/1486  4.00  4.32  4.32  4.37  4.00
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  500/1489  4.67  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.67
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  1  0  0  2  2  3.80  856/1277  3.80  3.64  4.03  4.08  3.80


              Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  3  2  4.40  554/1279  4.40  3.95  4.17  4.34  4.40
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  355/1270  4.80  4.26  4.35  4.53  4.80
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  584/1269  4.60  4.10  4.35  4.55  4.60
 4. Were special techniques successful                   2   2  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  464/ 878  4.00  4.18  4.05  4.11  4.00


                                 Frequency Distribution

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

Title   GMP'S FOR BIOPROCESSES   Baltimore County   JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: MOREIRA, ANTONI   Spring 2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 23   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept UMBC Level  Sect
          Questions                    NR NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
          General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   3  0  0  0  1  5 14  4.65  429/1576  4.65  4.49  4.30  4.43  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3  0  0  0  0  6 14  4.70  350/1576  4.70  4.44  4.27  4.32  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3  3  0  0  0  3 14  4.82  227/1342  4.82  4.37  4.32  4.38  4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    3  1  0  0  0  4 15  4.79  218/1520  4.79  4.38  4.25  4.36  4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  2  4 13  4.58  322/1465  4.58  4.06  4.12  4.25  4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4  1  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  138/1434  4.83  4.30  4.14  4.35  4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4  0  0  0  1  5 13  4.63  375/1547  4.63  4.20  4.19  4.24  4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled                  4  0  0  0  0  0 19  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.58  4.64  4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0  0  0  0  6 10  4.63  298/1554  4.63  4.15  4.10  4.18  4.63

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3  0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  149/1488  4.95  4.58  4.47  4.52  4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3  0  0  0  0  0 20  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.82  4.73  4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  0  0  0  2 17  4.89  181/1486  4.89  4.32  4.32  4.37  4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  0  0  0  5 15  4.75  378/1489  4.75  4.31  4.32  4.38  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  0  0  0  1  5 13  4.63  236/1277  4.63  3.64  4.03  4.08  4.63

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  6 14  4.70  312/1279  4.70  3.95  4.17  4.34  4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  2  2 16  4.70  478/1270  4.70  4.26  4.35  4.53  4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  1  1 18  4.85  332/1269  4.85  4.10  4.35  4.55  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                  3  3  1  1  2  3 10  4.18  410/ 878  4.18  4.18  4.05  4.11  4.18

          Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               18  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00 ****/ 375  ****  ****  4.01  4.10  ****

          Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 326  ****  ****  4.03  4.10  ****

          Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    17  0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/ 382  5.00  5.00  4.08  4.13  5.00
```

                                      Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      4      0.00-0.99   0       A   15        Required for Majors  0     Graduate    10      Major        0
28-55      1      1.00-1.99   0       B    2
56-83      0      2.00-2.99   0       C    0        General              2     Under-grad  13      Non-major   23
84-150     0      3.00-3.49   2       D    0
Grad.     10      3.50-4.00  10       F    0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                      I    0        Other               14
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: ENCH 666  8010                    University of Maryland                              Page  672
Title      BIOTECH FAC DESIGN                      Baltimore County                                   JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   LUBINIECKI, ANT                      Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     14
Questionnaires: 10                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                   NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean    Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80  243/1576  4.80  4.49  4.30  4.43  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   2   4   4  4.20  996/1576  4.20  4.44  4.27  4.32  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1   1   0   0   2   2   4  4.25  835/1342  4.25  4.37  4.32  4.38  4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   1   0   0   2   3   3  4.13  977/1520  4.13  4.38  4.25  4.36  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  5  0  1  1  0  3  4.00  850/1465  4.00  4.06  4.12  4.25  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1  1  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.30  4.14  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1   1   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  527/1547  4.50  4.20  4.19  4.24  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1574  5.00  4.58  4.64  4.75  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  3  0  0  1  3  3  0  3.29 1381/1554  3.29  4.15  4.10  4.18  3.29

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   2   0   1   7  4.30 1072/1488  4.30  4.58  4.47  4.52  4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   5   5  4.50 1210/1493  4.50  4.82  4.73  4.80  4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  0  0  1  1  0  3  5  4.00 1101/1486  4.00  4.32  4.32  4.37  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   1   2   0   2   5  3.80 1236/1489  3.80  4.31  4.32  4.38  3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0  1  3  0  1  2  3  3.22 1114/1277  3.22  3.64  4.03  4.08  3.22

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  1  0  4  0  0  2  3  3.00 1186/1279  3.00  3.95  4.17  4.34  3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  1  0  3  1  1  2  2  2.89 1231/1270  2.89  4.26  4.35  4.53  2.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  1  0  3  0  2  0  4  3.22 1184/1269  3.22  4.10  4.35  4.55  3.22
4. Were special techniques successful                 1   7   0   1   1   0   0  2.50 ****/ 878  ****  4.18  4.05  4.11  ****

                 Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information  9  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 240  ****  3.86  4.35  4.37  ****

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  7  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.72  4.79  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  7  2  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.69  4.77  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  7  2  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  ****  4.64  4.70  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   8   1   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.61  4.70  ****

                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  8  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.48  4.40  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  8  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.40  4.76  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      7   2   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.73  4.88  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  8   1   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.57  4.65  ****

                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA       Expected Grades           Reasons                    Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
   00-27     1       0.00-0.99   1      A    7         Required for Majors   1      Graduate       5      Major        1
   28-55     0       1.00-1.99   0      B    0
   56-83     0       2.00-2.99   0      C    0         General               1      Under-grad     5      Non-major    9
   84-150    0       3.00-3.49   0      D    0
   Grad.     5       3.50-4.00   2      F    0         Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                      responses to be significant
                                        I    0         Other                 4
                                        ?    0
```