

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 225 01
Title:	Chem Eng Prob Solving
Instructor:	Marten,Mark R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	15	14	4.14	1017/1449	4.14	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	12	11	8	3.51	1324/1446	3.51	4.27	4.29	4.27	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	9	14	7	3.54	1156/1256	3.54	4.17	4.34	4.36	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	6	6	16	7	3.69	1202/1402	3.69	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	6	13	12	3.89	954/1358	3.89	4.07	4.13	4.13	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	10	15	8	3.83	980/1327	3.83	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	8	12	10	3.69	1192/1435	3.69	4.05	4.20	4.17	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	316/1446	4.94	4.65	4.67	4.63	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	16	7	4	3.25	1334/1437	3.31	4.08	4.12	4.10	3.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	4	9	11	9	3.76	1272/1386	3.95	4.39	4.48	4.46	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	6	10	17	4.33	1250/1390	4.48	4.76	4.74	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	7	10	10	6	3.45	1278/1379	3.33	4.21	4.34	4.31	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	4	4	7	12	4	3.26	1315/1379	3.37	4.20	4.36	4.37	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	3	5	2	9	3	3.18	1122/1236	3.16	3.95	4.08	4.16	3.16
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	****/1122	****	4.26	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	****/1121	****	4.28	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	3	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	4.01	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 225 01
Title:	Chem Eng Prob Solving
Instructor:	Marten,Mark R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	4	3	6	7	3.67	180/200	3.67	4.11	4.28	4.35	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	3	2	6	3	7	3.43	187/205	3.43	3.95	4.29	4.10	3.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	169/201	4.19	4.46	4.51	4.42	4.19
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	3	3	6	2	6	3.25	196/202	3.25	3.61	4.42	4.32	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	4	3	4	4	5	3.15	185/196	3.15	3.32	4.25	4.10	3.15

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Graduate	Major 28
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 13		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 8	Under-grad	Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 6		
			Other 0		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 225 01
Title:	Chem Eng Prob Solving
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	15	14	4.14	1017/1449	4.14	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	12	11	8	3.51	1324/1446	3.51	4.27	4.29	4.27	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	9	14	7	3.54	1156/1256	3.54	4.17	4.34	4.36	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	6	6	16	7	3.69	1202/1402	3.69	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	6	13	12	3.89	954/1358	3.89	4.07	4.13	4.13	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	10	15	8	3.83	980/1327	3.83	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	8	12	10	3.69	1192/1435	3.69	4.05	4.20	4.17	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	316/1446	4.94	4.65	4.67	4.63	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	1	13	13	3	3.36	1301/1437	3.31	4.08	4.12	4.10	3.31
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	7	11	14	4.15	1117/1386	3.95	4.39	4.48	4.46	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	6	24	4.64	1036/1390	4.48	4.76	4.74	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	5	8	8	7	3.21	1321/1379	3.33	4.21	4.34	4.31	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	3	4	10	9	3.48	1261/1379	3.37	4.20	4.36	4.37	3.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	15	1	4	4	4	2	3.13	1130/1236	3.16	3.95	4.08	4.16	3.16
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	****/1122	****	4.26	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	****/1121	****	4.28	4.40	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	3	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	4.01	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 225 01
Title:	Chem Eng Prob Solving
Instructor:	Loehe,Joseph R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	50
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	4	3	6	7	3.67	180/200	3.67	4.11	4.28	4.35	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	3	2	6	3	7	3.43	187/205	3.43	3.95	4.29	4.10	3.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	169/201	4.19	4.46	4.51	4.42	4.19
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	3	3	6	2	6	3.25	196/202	3.25	3.61	4.42	4.32	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	4	3	4	4	5	3.15	185/196	3.15	3.32	4.25	4.10	3.15

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	28
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 13		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 6		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 427 01
Title:	Trans Proc II:Mass Tran
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	9	28	4.68	348/1449	4.68	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	13	22	4.50	571/1446	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	15	20	4.42	619/1256	4.42	4.17	4.34	4.43	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	8	10	19	4.30	771/1402	4.30	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	16	4.08	786/1358	4.08	4.07	4.13	4.21	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	3	5	7	14	3.90	933/1327	3.90	4.31	4.16	4.28	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	14	20	4.39	622/1435	4.39	4.05	4.20	4.27	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	34	4.89	546/1446	4.89	4.65	4.67	4.71	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	15	14	4.26	627/1437	4.26	4.08	4.12	4.20	4.26
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	27	4.68	583/1386	4.68	4.39	4.48	4.55	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	32	4.84	684/1390	4.84	4.76	4.74	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	14	19	4.34	823/1379	4.34	4.21	4.34	4.40	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	11	22	4.46	737/1379	4.46	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	18	2	0	4	8	4	3.67	954/1236	3.67	3.95	4.08	4.13	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	2	4	9	3	3.58	908/1121	3.58	3.99	4.18	4.39	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	1	5	5	7	3.84	938/1122	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.54	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	1	2	8	6	3.94	894/1121	3.94	4.28	4.40	4.60	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	21	6	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	540/790	3.82	4.26	4.06	4.27	3.82

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 427 01
Title:	Trans Proc II :Mass Tran
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	49
Questionnaires:	38

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	36
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	2
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 440 01
Title:	Chem Engineering Kinetics
Instructor:	Reed, Brian E

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	31	4.79	228/1449	4.79	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	25	4.62	425/1446	4.62	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	28	4.72	313/1256	4.72	4.17	4.34	4.43	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	3	10	18	4.41	670/1402	4.41	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	12	25	4.68	224/1358	4.68	4.07	4.13	4.21	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	3	9	18	4.50	404/1327	4.50	4.31	4.16	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	10	26	4.56	420/1435	4.56	4.05	4.20	4.27	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	31	4.82	707/1446	4.82	4.65	4.67	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	14	16	4.36	516/1437	4.36	4.08	4.12	4.20	4.36
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	10	26	4.59	726/1386	4.59	4.39	4.48	4.55	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	6	3	30	4.62	1058/1390	4.62	4.76	4.74	4.78	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	14	20	4.36	814/1379	4.36	4.21	4.34	4.40	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	27	4.54	655/1379	4.54	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	1	7	10	7	3.92	800/1236	3.92	3.95	4.08	4.13	3.92
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	10	5	10	10	2	2.70	1083/1121	2.70	3.99	4.18	4.39	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	7	5	11	7	7	3.05	1078/1122	3.05	4.26	4.36	4.54	3.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	5	6	9	11	3.44	1029/1121	3.44	4.28	4.40	4.60	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	3	26	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	545/790	3.80	4.26	4.06	4.27	3.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 440 01
Title:	Chem Engineering Kinetics
Instructor:	Reed, Brian E

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	47
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/205	****	3.95	4.29	3.91	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	38
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	1
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 442 01
Title:	Chem Engineering Sys Anl
Instructor:	Smith,Jeffrey M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	12	4.00	1106/1449	4.00	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	7	15	4.26	863/1446	4.26	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	14	4.25	784/1256	4.25	4.17	4.34	4.43	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	5	7	11	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	4	2	2	8	5	3.38	1212/1358	3.38	4.07	4.13	4.21	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	1	12	8	4.13	765/1327	4.13	4.31	4.16	4.28	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	3	12	7	3.77	1160/1435	3.77	4.05	4.20	4.27	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	7	4.25	1212/1446	4.25	4.65	4.67	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	7	11	4	3.78	1096/1437	3.78	4.08	4.12	4.20	3.78
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	1022/1386	4.30	4.39	4.48	4.55	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	6	16	4.33	1250/1390	4.33	4.76	4.74	4.78	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	5	7	11	3.93	1110/1379	3.93	4.21	4.34	4.40	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	4	15	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	709/1236	4.00	3.95	4.08	4.13	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	2
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 442 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 39
Title: Chem Engineering Sys Anl		Questionnaires: 28
Instructor: Smith,Jeffrey M		

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0									
				I	0	Other	0							
				?	8									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 446 01
Title:	Proc Engineering Econ II
Instructor:	Castellanos,Mar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	10	19	4.47	649/1449	4.47	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	1044/1446	4.03	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	936/1256	4.00	4.17	4.34	4.43	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	19	4.41	670/1402	4.41	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	427/1358	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.21	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	10	13	4.13	774/1327	4.13	4.31	4.16	4.28	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	3	7	9	10	3.90	1068/1435	3.90	4.05	4.20	4.27	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	3	11	9	8	3.71	1422/1446	3.71	4.65	4.67	4.71	3.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	11	18	4.47	406/1437	4.47	4.08	4.12	4.20	4.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	14	9	4.28	1030/1386	4.28	4.39	4.48	4.55	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	787/1390	4.81	4.76	4.74	4.78	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	2	12	10	4.24	911/1379	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.40	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	8	6	6	3.44	1276/1379	3.44	4.20	4.36	4.44	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	2	6	3	8	3.89	828/1236	3.89	3.95	4.08	4.13	3.89
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	702/1121	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.39	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.26	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	761/1121	4.27	4.28	4.40	4.60	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	235/790	4.44	4.26	4.06	4.27	4.44

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 446 01
Title:	Proc Engineering Econ II
Instructor:	Castellanos,Mar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	32

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.11	4.28	4.11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	3.95	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.46	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	3.61	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	3.32	4.25	3.43	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.09	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 450 01
Title:	Chem Process Development
Instructor:	Rudesill,John A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	705/1449	4.42	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	677/1446	4.42	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	345/1256	4.68	4.17	4.34	4.43	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	468/1402	4.56	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	827/1358	4.00	4.07	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	611/1327	4.32	4.31	4.16	4.28	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	655/1435	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.27	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.65	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	835/1437	4.06	4.08	4.12	4.20	4.06
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	583/1386	4.68	4.39	4.48	4.55	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	684/1390	4.84	4.76	4.74	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	716/1379	4.44	4.21	4.34	4.40	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	666/1379	4.53	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	616/1236	4.18	3.95	4.08	4.13	4.18
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1122	****	4.26	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1121	****	4.28	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	4.27	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 450 01
Title:	Chem Process Development
Instructor:	Rudesill,John A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.11	4.28	4.11	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	3.95	4.29	3.91	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.46	4.51	4.19	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	3.61	4.42	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	3.32	4.25	3.43	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.09	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.20	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 450 01
Title:	Chem Process Development
Instructor:	Rudesill,John A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	3	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 484 01
Title:	Biomedical Engineering
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	553/1449	4.53	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	186/1446	4.80	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	569/1256	4.47	4.17	4.34	4.43	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	362/1402	4.64	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	310/1358	4.57	4.07	4.13	4.21	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	299/1327	4.62	4.31	4.16	4.28	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	336/1435	4.64	4.05	4.20	4.27	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1079/1446	4.43	4.65	4.67	4.71	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	659/1437	4.23	4.08	4.12	4.20	4.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	498/1386	4.73	4.39	4.48	4.55	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	633/1390	4.87	4.76	4.74	4.78	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	437/1379	4.67	4.21	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	508/1379	4.67	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	624/1236	4.17	3.95	4.08	4.13	4.17
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	335/1121	4.60	3.99	4.18	4.39	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.26	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.28	4.40	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	102/790	4.75	4.26	4.06	4.27	4.75

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 484 01
Title:	Biomedical Engineering
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	4.27	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 8	Required for Majors	6 Graduate 4 Major 9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 1	General	1 Under-grad 11 Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	7
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 485L 01
Title:	Biochem Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Rao, Govind

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	571/1446	4.50	4.27	4.29	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	763/1256	4.29	4.17	4.34	4.43	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1402	4.75	4.35	4.27	4.35	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	483/1358	4.40	4.07	4.13	4.21	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	290/1327	4.63	4.31	4.16	4.28	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	1364/1435	3.14	4.05	4.20	4.27	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1019/1446	4.50	4.65	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1062/1437	3.83	4.08	4.12	4.20	3.83
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	320/1386	4.83	4.39	4.48	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.76	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	437/1379	4.67	4.21	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	508/1379	4.67	4.20	4.36	4.44	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	709/1236	4.00	3.95	4.08	4.13	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	3.99	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	****	4.26	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	****	4.28	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	4.27	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 485L 01
Title:	Biochem Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Rao, Govind

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/200	5.00	4.11	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/205	5.00	3.95	4.29	3.91	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/201	5.00	4.46	4.51	4.19	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	145/202	4.33	3.61	4.42	3.90	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	173/196	3.67	3.32	4.25	3.43	3.67
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.09	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.20	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 485L 01
Title:	Biochem Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Rao, Govind

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 630 01
Title:	Transport Phenomena
Instructor:	Frey,Douglas D

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	719/1449	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.41	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	819/1446	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.30	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	450/1256	4.59	4.17	4.34	4.30	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	373/1402	4.64	4.35	4.27	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	796/1358	4.07	4.07	4.13	4.18	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	253/1327	4.67	4.31	4.16	4.29	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	215/1435	4.75	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	1072/1446	4.44	4.65	4.67	4.81	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.17	4.25
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	707/1386	4.60	4.39	4.48	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	906/1390	4.73	4.76	4.74	4.77	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	996/1379	4.13	4.21	4.34	4.34	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	3	8	4.07	1027/1379	4.07	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	709/1236	4.00	3.95	4.08	3.94	4.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	893/1121	3.63	3.99	4.18	4.29	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	821/1122	4.13	4.26	4.36	4.44	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	825/1121	4.13	4.28	4.40	4.52	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	425/790	4.00	4.26	4.06	4.08	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 630 01
Title:	Transport Phenomena
Instructor:	Frey,Douglas D

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	17

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	13	Graduate 7 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 3	F 0 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 654 01
Title:	Chem Proc Analy/Optimzin
Instructor:	Castellanos,Mar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.44	4.33	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	863/1446	4.25	4.27	4.29	4.30	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1163/1256	3.50	4.17	4.34	4.30	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	528/1402	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1296/1358	3.00	4.07	4.13	4.18	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	253/1327	4.67	4.31	4.16	4.29	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1401/1435	2.75	4.05	4.20	4.23	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1019/1446	4.50	4.65	4.67	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1437	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.17	4.50
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1362/1386	3.00	4.39	4.48	4.47	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.76	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1379	4.00	4.21	4.34	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	709/1236	4.00	3.95	4.08	3.94	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 654 01
Title:	Chem Proc Analy/Optimzin
Instructor:	Castellanos,Mar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

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

Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives			3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	0									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 666 01
Title:	Biotech Fac Design
Instructor:	Moreira, Antonio

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	486/1449	4.58	4.44	4.33	4.41	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	724/1446	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	903/1256	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.30	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	584/1402	4.46	4.35	4.27	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	608/1358	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.18	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	543/1327	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.29	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	532/1435	4.46	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.65	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	321/1437	4.35	4.08	4.12	4.17	4.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	183/1386	4.74	4.39	4.48	4.47	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	478/1390	4.96	4.76	4.74	4.77	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	211/1379	4.63	4.21	4.34	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	295/1379	4.74	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	242/1236	4.62	3.95	4.08	3.94	4.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	283/1121	4.67	3.99	4.18	4.29	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	621/1122	4.42	4.26	4.36	4.44	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	537/1121	4.58	4.28	4.40	4.52	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	200/790	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.08	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 666 01
Title:	Biotech Fac Design
Instructor:	Moreira, Antonio

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.02	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.92	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	9	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 666 01
Title:	Biotech Fac Design
Instructor:	Lubiniecki,Anth

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	486/1449	4.58	4.44	4.33	4.41	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	724/1446	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	903/1256	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.30	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	584/1402	4.46	4.35	4.27	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	608/1358	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.18	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	543/1327	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.29	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	532/1435	4.46	4.05	4.20	4.23	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.65	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	758/1437	4.35	4.08	4.12	4.17	4.35
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	735/1386	4.74	4.39	4.48	4.47	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1390	4.96	4.76	4.74	4.77	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	743/1379	4.63	4.21	4.34	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	508/1379	4.74	4.20	4.36	4.35	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	264/1236	4.62	3.95	4.08	3.94	4.62
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	283/1121	4.67	3.99	4.18	4.29	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	621/1122	4.42	4.26	4.36	4.44	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	537/1121	4.58	4.28	4.40	4.52	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	200/790	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.08	4.50

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 666 01
Title:	Biotech Fac Design
Instructor:	Lubiniecki,Anth

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	22
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	****	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	****	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	****	4.00	4.02	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.35	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.92	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	9	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

