Course-Section: ENCH 225 0101

Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING

Instructor: GOOD, THERESA (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 606 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General		_	_	_	_		_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	12			1143/1504	3.96	4.24		4.26	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	10	5		1207/1503	3.75	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	9		979/1290		4.32	4.28	4.27	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1 10	1	4	3 5	12 2	8		821/1453 1305/1421	4.22	4.22	4.21	4.20 3.90	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5 6	8	9		759/1365	4.04	4.08	4.00	4.00	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	9	5	10		969/1485	4.04	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	5	9	9		1389/1504	4.04	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	11	3		1051/1483	4.08	4.00	4.09	4.00	
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	Τ.	4	тт	3	3.04	1031/1403	4.03	4.07	4.00	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	4	6	8	2	3.29	1340/1425	3.29	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	1128/1426	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	8	7	1	3.25	1307/1418	3.54	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1122/1416	3.84	4.34	4.26	4.24	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	714/1199	3.94	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	947/1312	3.67	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	0		4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 758	***	4.05	4.01	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	176/ 233	3.75	4.07	4.09	4.30	3.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	2	2	2	6	_	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	4.12	4.09	4.24	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	179/ 227	4.00	4.49	4.40	4.58	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	146/ 225	4.17	4.40	4.23	4.52	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	106/ 207		4.22	4.09		4.00
		Diat			_									

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grad	es Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						
Course-Se	ction: E	NCH 225 0101			1	University of Maryland				Page	607

Baltimore County Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GOOD, THERESA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								eque					tructor		e Dept		Level	Sec
		Question	.s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	1															
. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	1	3	12	7	3.96	1143/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.9
. Did the	instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	7	10	5	3.75	1207/1503	3.75	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.7
. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	9	3.96	979/1290	3.96	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.9
. Did other	er evalı	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	821/1453	4.22	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.2
				what you learned	0	10	1	4	5	2	2	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.0
				to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	8	9		759/1365			4.08	4.00	4.0
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	9	5	10		969/1485		4.20	4.16	4.15	4.0
		was class canc			0	0	0	1	5	9	9		1389/1504		4.68	4.69	4.68	4.0
. How woul	ld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	543/1483	4.09	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.0
		Lectur	е															
		uctor's lecture			19	0	1	0	1	1			****/1425		4.41	4.41		3.2
		ctor seem inter			18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1296/1426	4.33	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.3
				explained clearly	18	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1128/1418	3.54	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.5
		es contribute t		_	18	0	1	0	1	1			1131/1416			4.26	4.24	
. Did audi	iovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	19	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1199	3.94	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.9
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	947/1312	3.67	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.6
				ed to participate	18	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.3
				nd open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.0
. Were spe	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		18	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	**
		Labora	tory															
. Did the	lab ind	crease understa	nding o	of the material	12	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	176/ 233	3.75	4.07	4.09	4.30	3.
				ground information	12	0	2	2	2	6	0	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	4.12	4.09	4.24	3.0
. Were ned	cessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	12	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	179/ 227	4.00	4.49	4.40	4.58	4.
		structor provid			12	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17		4.17	4.40	4.23	4.52	4.1
. Were red	quiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specified	12	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	4.22	4.09	4.22	4.0
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 14		 Red	anir	ed f	 or M	 aior		0	 Graduat	 _	0	 Majo		 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6		1000	-1 ~ T T ,	-u -	J. 11	۱۰۰۰	~	•	Siddudt	_	•	11470	-	C
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 2	24	Non-	major	2
84-150	5	D 0		001						-	2		-		,			
Grad.						Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	ιh
	-	F 0 P 0								-	respons				_	, -		
			I O		Oti	her				2	1							
				2 1							_							

Course-Section: ENCH 427 0101 University of Maryland Page 608 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN

Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	5	4	16	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	13	4.32	765/1503	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	13	7		1005/1290	3.92	4.32	4.28	4.32	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	4	9	7		1129/1453	3.86	4.22	4.21	4.22	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	9	10	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	909/1365	3.89	4.11	4.08	4.09	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	602/1485	4.39	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	726/1504	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	373/1483	4.47	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	736/1425	4.54	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	878/1426	4.73	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	4	8	9		1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	937/1416	4.17	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	901/1199	3.56	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	814/1312	3.90	4.12	4.00	4.07	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	992/1303	3.90	4.39	4.24	4.34	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	3	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	***
-														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	±. 00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work	0.4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	4444 / EO	4444	2 00	4 42	4 02	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1 0	0	0	0	0		****/ 58 ****/ 56	****	3.98	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	-	0	1	0	0		,	****	4.12	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	U		****/ 44 ****/	****	4.68	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 47 ****/ 39	****	4.32	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	U	Т	0	U	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.19	^ ^ * *

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	3
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	

I 0 Other 20 ? 0

Course-Section: ENCH 440 0101 University of Maryland Page 609

Title Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 CHEM ENGINEERING KINET Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ROSS, JULIA

Course-Section: ENCH 441 0101

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	482/1504	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.56
-	_	tor make clear			3	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	880/1503	4.22	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.22
		estions reflec		_	3	0	1	2	1	6	8	4.00	937/1290		4.32	4.28	4.32	4.00
	_	ations reflect			3	1	2	0	2	8	5	3.82	1155/1453		4.22	4.21	4.22	3.82
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	1	13	4.39	429/1421	4.39	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.39
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	8	6	4.06	754/1365	4.06	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.06
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	3	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	926/1485	4.11	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.11
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	691/1504	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.89
				hing effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1030/1483	3.87	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.87
		.																
1 17 +1		Lectur	_		2	0	^	0	1	4	1 2	4 67	E70 /1 40E	4 67	4 41	4 41	4 20	4 67
		ctor's lecture			3	0	0	0		4	13	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.41 4.72	4.41	4.38	4.67
		n the subject	3	-	0	0	0	8	10		1089/1426	4.56			4.72	4.56		
		erial presente s contribute t		xplained clearly	3	0	0	0 1	4 3	3 6	11 8	4.39	727/1418 945/1416		4.29 4.34	4.25	4.25 4.26	4.39 4.17
				4	3 5	0	1	U T	3 3	6 2	2	3.50	945/1416		3.95	3.97	4.26	3.50
5. Did auc	ilovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	5	8	Т	U	3	2	2	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	4.07	***
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	***
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	4.38	***
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****
				Frequ	onar	. Diat	- wib	1+101	^									
				rrequ	lency	DISC	L I DI	10101	.1									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	:
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	nuire	 ed fo	or Ma	ior	s	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 9					110	, 01	_	-	02 33 34 6	-	_			ŭ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 4		Ger	nera.	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	3
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D 1													3	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
				P 0									respons				_	

Other

University of Maryland

13

Page 610

I

Title Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 RXN KINETICS IN BIOENG Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ROSS, JULIA

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	mier	ncies			Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	IIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1. Did vou d	gain new in:			n this course	1	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.18	1429/1504	3.18	4.24	4.27	4.33	3.18
				pected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	3		1136/1503	3.91	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.91
				spected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other					1	1	1	1	1	4	3		1214/1453	3.70	4.22	4.21	4.22	3.70
				hat you learned	1	7	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.50
				what you learned	1	5	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1225/1365	3.33	4.11	4.08	4.09	3.33
7. Was the	grading sys	tem clearl	y explai	ned	1	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.18
8. How many	times was	class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would	d you grade	the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	580/1483	4.30	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.30
		Lectur																
1. Were the	instructor	's lecture	s well p	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.40
				n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.78
				plained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4		4.33	, -	4.33	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.33
4. Did the 1					2	0	0	0	1	6		4.20	921/1416	4.20	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.20
5. Did audio	ovisual tecl	hniques en	hance yo	our understanding	4	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	177/1199	4.67	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.67
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	465/1312	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.40
				l to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2		4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
				l open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.80
4. Were spec	cial technio	ques succe	sstul		7	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.25
		Labora	-															
			_	the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	124/ 233	4.20	4.07	4.09	3.78	4.20
				ground information	7	0	0	0	2	2		3.80	178/ 244	3.80	4.12	4.09	3.56	3.80
				or lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	102/ 227	4.60	4.49	4.40	4.16	4.60
4. Did the 1				cance early specified	8 8	0 3	0	0	0	0	4 1	5.00	1/ 225 ****/ 207	5.00 ***	4.40	4.23	3.81 3.69	5.00 ***
o, mere requ		01 102 105	0100 010					-	Ü		_	3.00	, 20.			1.05	3.05	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earr	Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	\$			
00-27	0 0	.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	 jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55		.00-1.99	0	В 1			- neral						_		_	_		
56-83 84-150	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 4 D 0							-				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	1
Grad.	0 3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh		
	I 0		Oth	ner				1	0	respons	es LO D	e sign	ıııcan	ıL				

Course-Section: ENCH 442 0101 University of Maryland Page 611 Title Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 CHEM ENGINEERING SYS A Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SMITH, JEFFREY

Enrollment: 22

Questionn	aires:	16		Student Cou	ırse	Eval	uatio	on Qu	ıest:	ionn	aire							
							Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question				NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	813/1504	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.31
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	780/1503	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.31
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.25
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	764/1453	4.27	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.27
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	5	2	3.38	1189/1421	3.38	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.38
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	514/1365	4.31	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.31
		g system clearl			0	0	2	1	3	2	8	3.81	1140/1485	3.81	4.20	4.16	4.14	3.81
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1322/1504	4.19	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.19
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	961/1483	3.93	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.93
1. Were t	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	991/1425	4.31	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.31
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	1128/1426		4.72			4.50
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	993/1418	4.06	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.06
		es contribute t			0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1008/1416	4.06	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.06
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	9	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	4.07	***
				ed to participate		0	0	1	0	0			****/1303		4.39		4.34	***
		-	_	nd open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	4.38	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ution	ı									
Considit of E		G GDA	E				Das		_			m				Mada.		
Credits E	arnea	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				кеа	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	. — — — —	
00-27		0.00-0.99	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0	
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	B 3 C 2		Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-q	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	1
3 3 3 3 3												-			-)	_

Credits E	Earned							Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	 Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_		_	
				?	0						
Course-Se	ection: E	NCH 446 0101			U	niversity of Maryland				Page	612

Title Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 PROC ENGINEERING ECON Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KELLER, DAVID G

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quebelonn	all CD.	± ,		Beddelle cot	A1 DC	Lvar	aa C I	O11 Q	46561	. 01111								
							Fr	eque	ncies	5		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 yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	396/1504	4.63	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.63
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.25
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	5	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	378/1290	4.64	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.64
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	2	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	5	2	1	3	3	2	3.18	1262/1421	3.18	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.18
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	1	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	878/1365	3.93	4.11	4.08	4.09	3.93
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	914/1485	4.13	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.13
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.33
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	.ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	8	5	4.14	751/1483	4.14	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.14
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were tl	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.63
		ctor seem inter			1	0	1	0	0	2			1022/1426			4.69		
				explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6			736/1418		4.29		4.25	
		es contribute t			1		1	0	0				324/1416					
				our understanding	1	3	0	2	3	6			880/1199					3.62
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	4.07	****
				ed to participate	14	0	1		1	0			****/1303			4.24		****
		-	_	d open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	0			****/1299			4.25	4.38	****
		echniques succe		a open arboabbion	14	1	0	0	0	0			****/ 758			4.01		****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
	_			-														
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
			I 0		Ot1	her				1	.4							

University of Maryland Page 613 Course-Section: ENCH 484 0101

Title Baltimore County BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: OWENS, CAMELIA

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

~								~										
								-	ncies				tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	3	0	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1309/1504	3.64	4.24	4.27	4.33	3.64
		tor make clear			3	0	2	0	7	3	2		1388/1503		4.22	4.20	4.18	3.21
		estions reflec		_	3	0	0	3	3	4	4		1116/1290			4.28	4.32	3.64
		ations reflect			3	0	0	1	2	9	2	3.86	1136/1453	3.86	4.22	4.21	4.22	3.86
				what you learned	3	1	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1222/1421	3.31	4.08	4.00	4.02	3.31
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	9	2	3.79	981/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	4.09	3.79
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	3	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1230/1485	3.64	4.20	4.16	4.14	3.64
8. How max	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.29
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	3	3	6	0	3.25	1327/1483	3.25	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	1105/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.14
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	1	2	6	4	1	3.14	1320/1418	3.14	4.29	4.25	4.25	3.14
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	2	1	7	4	3.93	1085/1416	3.93	4.34	4.26	4.26	3.93
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	9	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	4.05	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	4.07	****
				ed to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
				nd open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****
		Semina	_															
	_	_		announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
			-	dividual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 70		4.54	4.35	4.63	****
	_	-		what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 67		4.32	4.34	4.34	****
_		ns contribute		-	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 76		4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear	?	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 A 7		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		100	-10-11	- L	5± 140		~	•	CIAGAAC	_	_			J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1			1	.0	Under-q	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0							_		3				3	-
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					6						

Course-Section: ENCH 485L 0101 University of Maryland Page 614 Title Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 BIOCHEM ENGINEERING LA Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RAO, GOVIND

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

***************************************				2										
			Fre	equei	ncies	S		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	6	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	1		1052/1503		4.22	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0		1155/1290	3.50	4.32	4.28	4.32	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1397/1421	2.40	4.08	4.00	4.02	2.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	395/1365	4.43	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	1	0	0	1.83	1482/1485	1.83	4.20	4.16	4.14	1.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1257/1425	3.75	4.41	4.41	4.38	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	1183/1426	4.43	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	1401/1416	2.00	4.34	4.26	4.26	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	56/ 233	4.60	4.07	4.09	3.78	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	187/ 244		4.12	4.09	3.56	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	50/ 227	4.86	4.49	4.40	4.16	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	95/ 225	4.57	4.40	4.23	3.81	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	205/ 207	2.71	4.22	4.09	3.69	2.71
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0			
84-150	4	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 sig	nificant				
				I	0	Other	7	_						
				?	0									

Course-Section: ENCH 630 0101 University of Maryland Page 615 Title Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 TRANSPORT PHENOMENA Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS

Enrollment: 9
Ouestionnaires: 9 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires:	9	Student Cou	ırse	Eval	uati	on Q	uest:	ionn	aire	<u>}</u>						
				Frequencies			S		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gair	n new insights,skills fr	om this course	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.13
2. Did the inst	cructor make clear the e	1	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1150/1503	3.88	4.22	4.20	4.28	3.88	
3. Did the exam	questions reflect the	expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1123/1290	3.63		4.28	4.36	3.63
4. Did other ev	valuations reflect the ϵ	xpected goals	1		0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.20
_	d readings contribute to	-	1		0	0	2	1	2	4.00	745/1421		4.08	4.00	4.27	4.00
	assignments contribute	-	1	3	0	0	1	2		4.20			4.11	4.08	4.35	4.20
_	ding system clearly expl	ained	1	0	0	0	2	3		4.13	- ,		4.20	4.16		4.13
	mes was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	,			4.69		5.00
9. How would yo	ou grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the ins	structor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.88
2. Did the inst	cructor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture	material presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1163/1418	3.75	4.29	4.25	4.36	3.75
4. Did the lect	tures contribute to what	you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	1112/1416	3.88	4.34	4.26	4.38	3.88
5. Did audiovis	sual techniques enhance	your understanding	1	4	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	820/1199	3.75	3.95	3.97	4.04	3.75
	Discussion															
1. Did class di	scussions contribute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all stu	dents actively encourage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.00
	ructor encourage fair a		6	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1258/1299	2.33	4.34	4.25	4.56	2.33
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							asons				Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 2 28-55 0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 5 B 2		Re						0	Graduat	e	5	Majo	or	0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3		
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0								
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough					
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	8						
				?	0								

Course-Section: ENCH 640 0101 University of Maryland Page 616 Title Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 ADV CHEM REACTN KINETI Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MARTEN, MARK

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1403/1504	3.33	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1155/1290	3.50	4.32	4.28	4.36	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1501/1504	2.50	4.68	4.69	4.79	2.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1093/1483	3.80	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1225/1418	3.60	4.29	4.25	4.36	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1348/1416	2.83	4.34	4.26	4.38	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.95	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3 83	858/1312	3.83	4 12	4 00	4.31	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0			851/1303			4.24	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	0	1			1025/1299				4.56	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	0			****/ 758		4.05			****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
	_					_								

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

University of Maryland Course-Section: ENCH 666 0101 Page 617

Title BIOTECH FAC DESIGN Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Instructor: STAFF Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: STAFF
Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						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	5	4.83	183/1504	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.22	4.21	4.34	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	Λ	Λ	2	Λ	2	4.20	632/1312	4.20	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	4.20	910/1303	4.20	4.12	4.24	4.58	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	0	1	2	4.20	834/1299	4.00	4.34	4.24	4.56	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1 1	4	0	0	0	1	ے 0		****/ 758	****	4.05	4.25	4.24	4.ZU ****
1. Were special techniques successivi		7	U	U	U		U	4.00	/ /30		1.03	T.01	1.21	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1	
				P	0			responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	1	-				
				2	0							