Course-Section: ENCH 225 01 University of Maryland Title Chem Eng Prob Solving Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Marten,Mark R

Enrollment: 51 Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 582

			Freque				ncie	s In			ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		General														
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	518/1447	4.42	4.42	4.31	4.31	4.56
		ctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	532/1447	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did t	he exam qu	estions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	734/1241	4.32	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.31
4. Did o	ther evalu	ations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	645/1402	4.13	4.23	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	626/1358	4.12	4.12	4.11	4.12	4.23
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contribute to what you learned	1 0	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	549/1316	4.09	4.07	4.14	4.08	4.33
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	632/1427	4.06	4.11	4.19	4.14	4.38
8. How m	any times	was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1042/1447	4.65	4.61	4.69	4.70	4.56
9. How w	ould you	grade the overall teaching effectivenes	2	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	679/1434	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.97	4.21
		Lecture														
1. Were	the instru	actor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1118/1387	4.19	4.44	4.46	4.42	4.14
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	919/1387	4.58	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was 1	ecture mat	2	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1018/1386	4.04	4.22	4.32	4.24	4.07	
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	971/1380	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.14
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.25	3.62	4.02	4.04	3.33
		Discussion														
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.33	3.91	4.15	4.12	4.67
2. Were	all studer	nts actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.51	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.60
		ctor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	576/1170		4.25	4.38	4.32	4.50
4. Were	special te	echniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	3.46	4.06	4.01	4.75
		Laboratory														
1. Did t	he lab ind	crease understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	124/ 189	3.98	4.21	4.34	4.47	4.23
2. Were	you provid	ded with adequate background information	ı 3	0	2	1	0	5	5	3.77	166/ 192	3.38	3.81	4.34	4.38	3.77
3. Were	necessary	materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	155/ 186	4.04	4.25	4.48	4.57	4.15
4. Did t	he lab ins	structor provide assistance	3	0	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	171/ 187	3.15	3.65	4.33	4.46	3.38
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	124/ 168	3.48	3.65	4.20	4.15	3.92
		Fre	quency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0 A 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 8	A 4 Requ					uired for Majors 14			Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	11

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 225 04 University of Maryland Title Chem Eng Prob Solving

?

0

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 583

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 28

Marten, Mark R

Instructor:

		ect ean
General		
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course $0  0  0  1  1  15  11  4.29  839/1447  4.42  4.42$		. 29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 4 7 8 9 3.79 1217/1447 4.14 4.24		. 79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 3 10 14 4.32 726/1241 4.32 4.36		. 32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 1 5 11 7 3.88 1088/1402 4.13 4.23		. 88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 2 6 9 10 4.00 799/1358 4.12 4.12		.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 1 4 10 8 3.84 944/1316 4.09 4.07		.84
		.75
		.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 1 2 3 11 8 3.92 956/1434 4.07 4.07	4.10 3.97 3.	92
Lecture		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 1 3 10 11 4.24 1055/1387 4.19 4.44	4.46 4.42 4.	. 24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 1 3 5 16 4.44 1179/1387 4.58 4.81	4.73 4.71 4.	. 44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 1 2 4 7 11 4.00 1047/1386 4.04 4.22	4.32 4.24 4.	.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 5 8 12 4.28 858/1380 4.21 4.15	4.32 4.30 4.	. 28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 8 3 2 3 7 2 3.18 1057/1193 3.25 3.62	4.02 4.04 3.	.18
Discussion		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 1 2 2 4 4.00 710/1172 4.33 3.91	4.15 4.12 4.	.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 0 1 0 1 5 4.43 621/1182 4.51 4.38		.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 0 1 0 2 4 4.29 745/1170 4.39 4.25	4.38 4.32 4.	. 29
4. Were special techniques successful 21 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 ****/ 800 4.75 3.46	4.06 4.01 **	***
Laboratory		
	4.34 4.47 3.	.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 3 6 7 6 3 3.00 183/ 192 3.38 3.81		.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3 0 2 2 2 9 10 3.92 167/ 186 4.04 4.25		.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 2 6 3 6 3 5 2.91 180/ 187 3.15 3.65		.91
		.04
Frequency Distribution		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type	Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 12 Required for Majors 25 Graduate 0	 Major 2	25
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8	-	
56-83 12 2.00-2.99 3 C 3 General 0 Under-grad 28	Non-major	3
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 7 D 0		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are $P=0$ responses to be significant.	_	
i desponses to be significant.		

Course-Section: ENCH 427 01 University of Maryland Page 584 Title JUN 28, 2010

Trans Proc II: Mass Tra Baltimore County Spring 2010 Bayles,Taryn M

I ?

0

4

Enrollment:	42
Questionnaires:	39

Instructor:

Ctudent	Cource	Evaluation	Questionnai	ro
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnai	ııe

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA		_	3	4	5	Mean			_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	5	14	15	4.14	980/1447	4.14	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	8	15	10	3.86	1168/1447	3.86	4.24	4.27	4.31	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	8	10	13	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.36	4.33	4.41	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	13	10	9	3.88	1094/1402	3.88	4.23	4.24	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	7	5	15	6	3.39	1217/1358	3.39	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne	d 3	5	1	8	10	6	6	3.26	1223/1316	3.26	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	803/1447	4.77	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 8	1	1	0	7	12	10	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	769/1387	4.53	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	6	26	4.68	970/1387	4.68	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	12	11	9	3.76	1188/1386		4.22	4.32	4.34	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	4	8	8	12	3.71	1185/1380	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	18	2	3	0	6	2	3.23	1044/1193	3.23	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	5	2	8	5	2	2.86	1123/1172	2.86	3.91	4.15	4.25	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	3	7	3	7	3.45	1092/1182	3.45	4.38	4.35	4.49	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	3	2	6	7	3	3.24	1120/1170	3.24	4.25	4.38	4.51	3.24
4. Were special techniques successful	18	11	3	4	1	1	1	2.30			3.46	4.06		2.30
Fre	quency	y Di:	strik	outio	n									
Gualita Farmal Guale	_					_			m.				24	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				R€ 	asor	15 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3	Required for Majors				4	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	34			
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 15	-													
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 5 C 11	General 0				0	Under-g	Non-	5						

credits Ea	arned	Cuiii. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		туре		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	1	Major	34	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	15							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	5	
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	1							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		

Other

1

Course-Section: ENCH 440 02 University of Maryland Title Chem Engineering Kinet

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 37

Castellanos, Mar Instructor: 44 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland	Page 585
Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

			Frequencie					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	1	3	17	16	4.30	829/1447	4.30	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	8	17	9	3.92	1132/1447	3.92	4.24	4.27	4.31	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	11	10	13	3.84	1034/1241	3.84	4.36	4.33	4.41	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	7	14	13	4.06	943/1402	4.06	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	12	18	4.31	551/1358	4.31	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	0	6	7	8	3.71	1026/1316	3.71	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	1	5	8	11	8	3.61	1228/1427	3.61	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	3	14	18	4.43	1139/1447	4.43	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	6	0	9	13	7	3.43	1269/1434	3.43	4.07	4.10	4.17	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	9	11	12		1207/1387	3.94	4.44	4.46	4.48	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	7	22		1179/1387	4.44	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	7	11	8	8		1258/1386	3.50	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	13	6	9	3.52	1243/1380	3.52	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	22	3	0	5	1	3	3.08	1077/1193	3.08	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	5	3	9	2	2 92	1116/1172	2.92	3.91	4.15	4.25	2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	6	9	3	5		1127/1182	3.21	4.38	4.35	4.49	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			3	1	5	6	7		1035/1170	3.59	4.25	4.38	4.51	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful			3	1	2	3	2	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	3.46	4.06	4.19	3.00
	14	12	,	_	_		_	2.00		2700	0	00		2.30
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Туре			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	1	Major	35	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	2	
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				?	3							

Course-Section: ENCH 442 01 University of Maryland Chem Engineering Sys A Baltimore County

Title JUN 28, 2010 Instructor: Smith, Jeffrey M Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 586

Enrollment:	33	-	
Questionnaires:	8		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

D 0

F 0

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49 1

3.50-4.00 0

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	ctor 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	Λ	1	1	2	4.25	869/1447	4.28	4.42	4.31	4 43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	853/1447	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.25	541/1241	4.50	4.24	4.33	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.00
	0	2	1	Τ.	0	2	2	4.00	799/1358	3.74	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned				0	0	2	5		,		4.12			
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	•	•	2	5	4.71	196/1316			4.14	4.27	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	Ţ	Ţ	0	0	3	3	4.00	971/1427	4.03	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	./	4.88	565/1447	4.94	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	431/1434	4.16	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	970/1387	4.35	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.78	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.57	539/1386	4.41	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	739/1380	4.50	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	0	Λ -	0		1188/1193	2.30	3.62	4.02	4.00	1.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	5	2	U	U	U	U	1.00	1100/1193	2.30	3.02	4.02	4.00	1.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	 mire	 ed fo	or Ma	aiors		7	Graduat	 -	0	Majo	 r	8
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		1.0.	2411	-a 10	J_ 1.10	~	_	•	Gradati	_	•	1100	-	J
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 C 1		Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	0

Electives

Other

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENCH 442 02 University of Maryland Title

Chem Engineering Sys A Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Smith, Jeffrey M Instructor: Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 587

Enrollment:	33					
Ouestionnaires:	19		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

84-150

Grad.

6

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

6

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

1

Out at the same							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	810/1447	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.32
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	6	4.26	843/1447	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.26
3. Did	the exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	2	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	8	3	3.47	1182/1358	3.74	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.47
6. Did v	written as:	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	8	4	3.74	1008/1316	4.23	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.74
7. Was	the grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	942/1427	4.03	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.05
8. How t	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.61	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How v	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes				2	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	996/1434	4.16	4.07	4.10	4.17	3.88
	Lecture																	
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	931/1387	4.35	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.38
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1090/1387	4.78	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.56
				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	879/1386	4.41	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.25
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	593/1380	4.50	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance :	your understanding	4	10	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	927/1193	2.30	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.60
	Fred					Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
																	10	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					Re	quire	ea i	or M	ajor	s I	.7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	19	
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8					<b>a</b>		,				0	TT		0	37		0	
56-83	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 2					Ge	nera:	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	0

Electives

Other

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENCH 446 02 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Proc Engineering Econ Instructor: Castellanos, Mar Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------------------------------	---------	--------	------------	---------------

Page 588

Questions				NR	NA	Fre 1	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General	 I															
1 Did vou	gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	n this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	265/1447	4.79	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.79
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	10	12	4.38	715/1447	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.38
		estions reflect			0	10	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	634/1241	4.43	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.43
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	114/1402		4.23	4.24	4.34	4.88
				what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	14	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.25
		system clearly			0	0	1	2	3	9	9	3.96	1024/1427	3.96	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.96
8. How man	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	1147/1447	4.42	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.42
9. How wou	ld you g	grade the overal	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.50
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures		· -	2	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	850/1387		4.44	4.46	4.48	4.45
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	,	4.91	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.91
	1 1					0	0	1	0	11	9	4.33	811/1386		4.22	4.32	4.34	4.33
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	2	1	2	7	8		1104/1380		4.15	4.32		3.90
5. Did aud	liovisual	. techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	3	4	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	493/1193	4.24	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.24
		Discuss																
1 Did ala	aa diaa			what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	1 60	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4 25	****
				d to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	- <del>1</del>		****/1182		4.38	4.15	4.49	****
				d open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	4		****/1170		4.25	4.38	4.51	****
		chniques succes		d Open discussion	19	1	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 800		3.46	4.06	4.19	****
i. Were bp	cciai cc	ciniiques succei	BLUI		17	_	U	O	_	O	J	1.50	, 000		3.10	1.00	1.10	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 13					Required for Maj					s 2	. – – – – . !2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1.0	-1 (					-	or adda c	-	-		_	
56-83					Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	major	4	
84-150												3				3		
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	<sub>i</sub> h
	P 1												respons				_	•
	I 0					Otl	ner					0	-					
	I 0 ? 4																	

Course-Section: ENCH 450 01 University of Maryland Page 589 JUN 28, 2010

Title Chem Process Developme Baltimore County Rudesill, John A Spring 2010 Instructor:

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

0	a	The last days	0
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	298/1447	4.77	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.77
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	413/1447	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.62
	_	estions reflec		1 0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1241	4.85	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.85
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	143/1402		4.23	4.24	4.34	4.83
	_	_		what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	441/1358		4.12	4.11	4.15	4.42
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	512/1316		4.07	4.14	4.27	4.38
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	422/1427	4.54	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.54
-		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447		4.61	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would	d you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.40
		Lectur			_		_	_	•					- 00			4 40	
		actor's lecture			1 1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387		4.44	4.46	4.48	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	Τ	11	4.92	122/1386		4.22	4.32	4.34	4.92
				-	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.75	339/1380		4.15	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audio	ovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	186/1193	4.67	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.67
		Discus	aion															
1 Did alsa	a diaa			what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	Λ	2	E 00	****/1172	****	2 01	4.15	4.25	****
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1182		4.38	4.35	4.49	***
				nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1170		4.25	4.38	4.51	***
		chniques succe		d open discussion	10	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 800		3.46	4.06	4.19	***
1. Were spec	ciai cc	ciniiques succe	BBLUI		10	_	O	U	O	_	_	1.50	, 666		3.10	1.00	1.10	
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ear	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5						~		or Ma			 7	Graduat		1	Majo	~~~~~	10
28-55						кес	4urr.	eu I	Jr I√lč	JOE	Ö	/	Graduat	E	Τ.	Ma JO	т.	ΤU
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	3
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 0					Gei	ici d	T				U	onder-9	rau 1	. 4	NOII-	iia jul	3
						רם.	ecti	700				4	#### -	Maana +	hara a	re not	enous	rh
					ET.	=CCI	ves				7					_	111	
	P 0 I 0					responses to be significa								can				

Course-Section: ENCH 459 01 University of Maryland Page 590 Title Stat Design Experiment Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Stat Design Experiment Baltimore County
Instructor: Loehe, Joseph R Spring 2010

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 10

es:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		Genera				_		_		_								
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	375/1447	4.70	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.70
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	1	2	5		1053/1447	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.00
	_	uestions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.60
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	797/1402	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.22
	_	_		what you learned	0	•	•	0	1	2	7	4.60		4.60	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.60
		_		o what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	1	5	4.25		4.25	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.25
		g system clearly	-	ined	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00		4.00	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.00
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	1	4	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.61	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How wo	outa you g	grade the overa.	II teac	hing effectiveness	3	U	U	U	Τ	4	2	4.14	754/1434	4.14	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.14
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	521/1387	4.70	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.70
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	2	0	5	3		1128/1386	3.90	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.90
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1185/1380	3.70	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.70
				our understanding	0	2	0	3	0	1	4		843/1193		3.62	4.02	4.00	3.75
		_	_	_														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ite to	what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	***
				T		- 54	<b>.</b> 10 .		_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	ıcıoı	11									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	auire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	4	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1.0	-1		10	- )	-	-	or adda c	-	-			•
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													5	-
Grad.					Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	<sub>f</sub> h	
	-			P 0		_							respons				_	•
				I O		Ot]	her					1			5			
	3 O																	

Course-Section: ENCH 484 01 University of Maryland Page 591 Title Biomedical Engineering Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Leach, Jennie B

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		General			0	0	0	0	0	2	1 -	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.83
		v insights,skil tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	15 15	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.83
		estions reflect	_	5	0	1	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	272/1241	4.03	4.24	4.27	4.41	4.03
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.76	143/1402	4.76	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.76
				hat you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.44	409/1358	4.63	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.63
	-	-		-	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.56	342/1316		4.12	4.14	4.15	4.44
		_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5 4	14	4.78	181/1427	4.78	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.56
		system clearly		.nea	0	0	0	0	0	4	14 17	4.78	- ,					
		vas class cance			1	0	1	0	0	T	11		291/1447	4.94	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.94
9. HOW WOL	ura you gi	rade the overa.	LI teach	ing effectiveness	Τ	U	Т	U	U	5	ΤŢ	4.47	374/1434	4.47	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.47
		Lecture	2															
1 Were th	he instruc	ctor's lectures		repared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	120/1387	4.94	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.94
		or seem inter	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.94
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	82/1386	4.94	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.94
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.83
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	186/1193	4.67	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.67
J. Dia au	aiovibaai	ccciniiques cin	iance ye	ar anderstanding	0	O	O	U	2			1.07	100/11/5	1.07	3.02	1.02	1.00	1.07
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ite to w	hat you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were al	ll student	s actively end	couraged	l to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
				l open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	ssful	_	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	1			Туј	pe			Majors	;			
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Per	anir		or Ma	ior	 a 1	0	Graduat		1	Majo		15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12		1000	quil	-u - i	JI 110	. , 0 -		. •	Gradace	_	_	11000	/_	13
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0								-					5	-
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res		5 #### - Means there are not			enous	rh				
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.l	her					0					-	
	I 0						-											

Course-Section: ENCH 485 01 Title

Biochem Engineering La

Instructor: Rao,Govind

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 592 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1447	4.90	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	426/1447	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.78	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1291/1427	3.40	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	803/1447	4.78	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	431/1434	4.43	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	171/1386	4.88	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	520/1380	4.63	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	224/1193	4.60	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	58/ 189	4.67	4.21	4.34	4.74	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 192	4.67	3.81	4.34	4.61	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	71/ 186	4.67	4.25	4.48	4.72	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7 7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	73/ 187	4.67	3.65	4.33	4.59	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	3.65	4.20	4.53	4.00

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	 6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 489 01

Spec Topics Envr Engr

Title LaKind,Judy S

Instructor: Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 593 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	^	^	0	^	1	_	0	4 00	007/1447	4 00	4 40	4 21	4 42	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0 1	0	1	2	2		927/1447	4.20	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1 2	0	3		1210/1447	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	∠ 1	Ţ	Ţ		1197/1241	3.20	4.36	4.33	4.41	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	•	U T	1	1	0	2		1343/1402	3.20	4.23	4.24	4.34	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	-	U T	Τ	Ţ	2	3.80	987/1358	3.80	4.12	4.11		3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1 0	0	1	2	2	0		1134/1316	3.50	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	•	0	U T	1	3	0		1291/1427	3.40	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	•	•	0 1	2	3		1018/1447	4.60	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1407/1434	2.50	4.07	4.10	4.17	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	Λ	1	Λ	3	3 80	1253/1387	3.80	4.44	4.46	4.48	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	2	1		1306/1386	3.20	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	1		1270/1380	3.40	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	2	0		1087/1193	3.40	3.62	4.02		3.40
5. Did additivisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U		U	2	4	U	3.00	1007/1193	3.00	3.02	4.02	4.00	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.75	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	720/ 800	3.25	3.46	4.06	4.19	3.25
•														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	3	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			_		•	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 630 01 University of Maryland Transport Phenomena Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 594

JUN 28, 2010

C+11d 0 m+	00117000	Erroluntion	Ouestionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1 Did you a	in new insight		ls from	this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4 00	1058/1447	4.00	4.42	4.31	4.46	4.00
	structor make				0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.30	4.57
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	0	6	4.71	323/1241	4.71	4.36	4.33	4.38	4.71
	evaluations re				0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.23	4.24	4.29	4.14
			_	nat you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	709/1358	4.14	4.12	4.11	4.26	4.14
_	_			what you learne	d 0	1	0	1	2	2	1		1134/1316	3.50	4.07	4.14	4.34	3.50
	ading system of			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.11	4.19	4.25	5.00
	imes was class	_	-		0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.61	4.69	4.74	
				ing effectivenes	s 2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	701/1434	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.21	4.20
	-			_														
1 Wara tha	l nstructor's le	Lecture		vonered	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.44	4.46	4.51	5.00
	structor seem				0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1387	5.00	4.44	4.73	4.81	5.00
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4		539/1386	4.57	4.22	4.73	4.43	4.57
	e materiai pro ctures contrib		-		0	0	0	0	2	1	4		858/1380	4.29	4.15	4.32	4.38	4.29
			_	ur understanding	-	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	288/1193		3.62	4.02		4.50
J. Dia audio	isdai teciniiq	des eilli	ance you	ar understanding	U	J	U	U	U	2	2	1.50	200/11/3	4.50	3.02	1.02	1.02	4.50
	I	Discuss	ion															
1. Did class	discussions co	ontribu	te to wl	nat you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.91	4.15	4.32	3.67
				to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.46	5.00
				open discussion	. 4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.25	4.38	4.52	5.00
	al techniques			-	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.10	***
_																		
				Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earne	d Cur	m. GPA		Expected Grade	s			Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0.00-0	 0.99	1	A 2		Re	guire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	;	5	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	r r	5
28-55	1.00-	1.99	0	В 4			-			,								
56-83	2.00-2	2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-150	3.00-3	3.49	0	D 1									_				-	
Grad.	3.50-4	4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	gh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: ENCH 640 01 University of Maryland Page 595 Title Adv Chem Reactn Kineti Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Good, Theresa

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Tne	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General															
1. Did you gain n	ew insights, skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1182/1447	3.88	4.42	4.31	4.46	3.88
	ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam q	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	683/1241	4.38	4.36	4.33	4.38	4.38		
4. Did other eval	uations reflect the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	891/1402	4.13	4.23	4.24	4.29	4.13
5. Did assigned r	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	952/1358	3.86	4.12	4.11	4.26	3.86
6. Did written as	signments contribute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	738/1316	4.13	4.07	4.14	4.34	4.13
7. Was the gradin	g system clearly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	632/1427	4.38	4.11	4.19	4.25	4.38
_	was class cancelled		0	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1430/1447	3.57	4.61	4.69	4.74	3.57
_	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.21	4.50
	Lecture															
1. Were the instr	ructor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1235/1387	3.88	4.44	4.46	4.51	3.88
	ctor seem interested		0	0	0	0	0	3	5		1030/1387	4.63	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.63
	terial presented and e	_	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	988/1386	4.13	4.22	4.32	4.43	4.13
	es contribute to what		0	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1030/1380		4.15	4.32	4.38	4.00
	l techniques enhance	-	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86			3.62	4.02		3.86
	Discussion															
1. Did class disc	sussions contribute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.91	4.15	4.32	4.50
	ents actively encourage	_	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182		4.38	4.35	4.46	5.00
	ctor encourage fair a		2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	, -		4.25	4.38	4.52	4.67
	echniques successful	ia open arboabbien	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	423/ 800		3.46	4.06		4.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5					 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	7	Graduat	 e	6	Majo	 or	3

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