Course-Section: ENCH 210 01

Title: Intro Environmental Eng

Instructor: Hennigan, Christ

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 9

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	218/1560	4.86	4.50	4.35	4.37	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	534/1559	4.57	4.28	4.31	4.33	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1187/1371	3.83	4.20	4.38	4.40	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	435/1519	4.60	4.36	4.27	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	620/1452	4.33	4.19	4.18	4.22	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	427/1430	4.50	4.23	4.16	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	283/1539	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.25	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	574/1560	4.86	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.19	4.14	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	315/1496	4.86	4.50	4.49	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	805/1496	4.43	4.31	4.37	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	466/1494	4.71	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.71

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 210 01

Title: Intro Environmental Eng

Instructor: Hennigan, Christ

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	473/1352	4.40	4.13	4.12	4.14	4.40

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 225 01

Title: Chem Eng Prob Solving

Instructor: Enszer,Joshua A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 55

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	402/1560	4.71	4.50	4.35	4.37	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	23	4.53	600/1559	4.53	4.28	4.31	4.33	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	7	21	4.44	701/1371	4.44	4.20	4.38	4.40	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	5	24	4.55	503/1519	4.55	4.36	4.27	4.29	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	6	7	17	4.16	814/1452	4.16	4.19	4.18	4.22	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	12	19	4.47	466/1430	4.47	4.23	4.16	4.15	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	273/1539	4.73	4.24	4.23	4.25	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	526/1560	4.88	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	14	11	4.17	827/1545	4.17	4.19	4.14	4.09	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	9	23	4.67	643/1496	4.67	4.50	4.49	4.52	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	733/1498	4.85	4.77	4.75	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	12	19	4.52	688/1496	4.52	4.31	4.37	4.36	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	21	4.52	714/1494	4.52	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	5	7	17	4.41	461/1352	4.41	4.13	4.12	4.14	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1250	****	4.07	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1239	****	4.32	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.19	****

Course-Section: ENCH 225 01

Title: Chem Eng Prob Solving

Instructor: Enszer,Joshua A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 55

'	•			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	4	12	11	4.07	137/206	4.07	4.48	4.25	4.58	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	3	1	8	9	8	3.62	199/214	3.62	4.09	4.31	4.60	3.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	139/204	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.64	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	2	1	4	7	14	4.07	173/207	4.07	4.54	4.44	4.67	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	3	10	14	4.17	120/199	4.17	4.48	4.27	4.51	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 225 01

Title: Chem Eng Prob Solving

Instructor: Enszer, Joshua A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 55

Questionnaires: 35

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	9	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	34
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENCH 412 01

Title: Env Physicochemical Proc

Instructor: Blaney,Lee

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 7

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.28	4.31	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.20	4.38	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	202/1452	4.75	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1430	4.83	4.23	4.16	4.25	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	153/1539	4.86	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1545	5.00	4.19	4.14	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.50	4.49	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.31	4.37	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1494	5.00	4.29	4.37	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	175/1352	4.71	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1248	5.00	3.93	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1250	4.50	4.07	4.39	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.61	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 412 01

Title: Env Physicochemical Proc

Instructor: Blaney,Lee

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/906	5.00	4.20	4.13	4.28	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 427 01

Title: Trans Proc II: Mass Tran

Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 46

'	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	21	4.43	779/1560	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	10	21	4.43	745/1559	4.43	4.28	4.31	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	10	21	4.40	747/1371	4.40	4.20	4.38	4.46	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	6	7	18	4.39	717/1519	4.39	4.36	4.27	4.33	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	8	16	4.06	908/1452	4.06	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	11	9	9	3.64	1172/1430	3.64	4.23	4.16	4.25	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	6	5	19	4.12	1007/1539	4.12	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	6	27	4.74	808/1560	4.74	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	2	10	15	4.36	612/1545	4.36	4.19	4.14	4.21	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	8	24	4.54	820/1496	4.54	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	28	4.74	954/1498	4.74	4.77	4.75	4.77	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	9	20	4.34	900/1496	4.34	4.31	4.37	4.40	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	10	21	4.44	800/1494	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	3	0	3	4	6	3.63	1113/1352	3.63	4.13	4.12	4.16	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	739/1248	4.18	3.93	4.23	4.39	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	675/1250	4.44	4.07	4.39	4.55	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	785/1239	4.38	4.32	4.45	4.61	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	19	7	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	637/906	3.89	4.20	4.13	4.28	3.89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 427 01

Title: Trans Proc II: Mass Tran

Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 35

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.48	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.09	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.54	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.48	4.27	4.42	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	Α	4	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	33
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	С	14	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	2
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Course-Section: ENCH 440 01

Title: Chem Engineering Kinetcs

Instructor: Reed, Brian E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 41

·				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	2	3	2	10	15	4.03	1175/1560	4.03	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	11	6	10	3.59	1425/1559	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.34	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	11	5	7	3.29	1326/1371	3.29	4.20	4.38	4.46	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	2	8	9	5	3.50	1411/1519	3.50	4.36	4.27	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	17	4.35	601/1452	4.35	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	1	6	7	7	3.48	1253/1430	3.48	4.23	4.16	4.25	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	5	6	11	3.57	1369/1539	3.57	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	14	4.45	1110/1560	4.45	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	4	8	6	1	3.10	1472/1545	3.10	4.19	4.14	4.21	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	8	8	10	3.68	1406/1496	3.68	4.50	4.49	4.50	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	5	9	13	3.97	1448/1498	3.97	4.77	4.75	4.77	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	6	5	12	7	3.58	1360/1496	3.58	4.31	4.37	4.40	3.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	6	7	7	6	3.17	1437/1494	3.17	4.29	4.37	4.41	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	6	8	3	2	2.86	1304/1352	2.86	4.13	4.12	4.16	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	16	4	3	4	3	2.13	1242/1248	2.13	3.93	4.23	4.39	2.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	7	5	5	5	7	3.00	1221/1250	3.00	4.07	4.39	4.55	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	4	8	3	10	3.46	1174/1239	3.46	4.32	4.45	4.61	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	3	17	5	1	3	0	3	2.58	890/906	2.58	4.20	4.13	4.28	2.58

Course-Section: ENCH 440 01

Title: Chem Engineering Kinetcs

Instructor: Reed, Brian E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 41

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.09	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.54	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.48	4.27	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 440 01

Title: Chem Engineering Kinetcs

Instructor: Reed,Brian E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 41

Questionnaires: 32

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	9	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	С	6	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Course-Section: ENCH 442 01

Title: Chem Engineering Sys Anl

Instructor: Enszer, Joshua A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 40

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	13	15	4.34	875/1560	4.34	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	15	4.26	942/1559	4.26	4.28	4.31	4.34	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	13	10	3.97	1100/1371	3.97	4.20	4.38	4.46	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	3	11	14	4.23	887/1519	4.23	4.36	4.27	4.33	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	11	9	8	3.68	1208/1452	3.68	4.19	4.18	4.25	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	8	11	10	3.94	971/1430	3.94	4.23	4.16	4.25	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	420/1539	4.61	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	182/1560	4.97	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	7	7	12	4.11	876/1545	4.11	4.19	4.14	4.21	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	22	4.61	727/1496	4.61	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	1023/1498	4.71	4.77	4.75	4.77	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	9	9	11	3.94	1230/1496	3.94	4.31	4.37	4.40	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	7	10	12	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	9	4	12	4.04	808/1352	4.04	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	****	4.07	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	****	4.32	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 442 01

Title: Chem Engineering Sys Anl

Instructor: Enszer, Joshua A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 32

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.28	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	7	С	6	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	1
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 446 01

Title: Proc Engineering Econ II

Instructor: Castellanos, Mar

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 40

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	0	2	12	20	4.43	779/1560	4.43	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	3	15	14	4.18	1021/1559	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.34	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	28	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1371	****	4.20	4.38	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	3	9	21	4.44	635/1519	4.44	4.36	4.27	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	23	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1290/1452	3.50	4.19	4.18	4.25	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	1	4	11	15	4.29	664/1430	4.29	4.23	4.16	4.25	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	5	9	6	9	3.26	1431/1539	3.26	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	17	16	4.48	1074/1560	4.48	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	4	12	9	4.08	905/1545	4.08	4.19	4.14	4.21	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	3	7	16	4.29	1120/1496	4.29	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	704/1498	4.86	4.77	4.75	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	7	5	15	4.21	1026/1496	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.40	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	5	2	6	3	11	3.48	1388/1494	3.48	4.29	4.37	4.41	3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	3	2	5	15	4.28	599/1352	4.28	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1250	****	4.07	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1239	****	4.32	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 446 01

Title: Proc Engineering Econ II

Instructor: Castellanos, Mar

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 40

Questionnaires: 38

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.28	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	16	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	38	Non-major	9
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Course-Section: ENCH 450 01

Title: Chem Process Development

Instructor: Rudesill, John A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 17

·				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	603/1560	4.56	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	715/1559	4.44	4.28	4.31	4.34	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	442/1371	4.67	4.20	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	492/1519	4.56	4.36	4.27	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	857/1452	4.11	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	375/1430	4.56	4.23	4.16	4.25	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	622/1539	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	733/1545	4.25	4.19	4.14	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1496	4.89	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.77	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	504/1496	4.67	4.31	4.37	4.40	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	532/1494	4.67	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	547/1352	4.33	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	****	3.93	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	****	4.07	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	****	4.32	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 450 01

Title: Chem Process Development

Instructor: Rudesill, John A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 12

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.28	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Course-Section: ENCH 484 01

Title: Biomedical Engineering

Instructor: Castellanos, Mar

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 16

	_			Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1082/1560	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	5	0	3.17	1513/1559	3.17	4.28	4.31	4.34	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1264/1371	3.60	4.20	4.38	4.46	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1294/1519	3.75	4.36	4.27	4.33	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	681/1452	4.27	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1061/1430	3.80	4.23	4.16	4.25	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	3	0	4	3.27	1430/1539	3.27	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	670/1560	4.82	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.19	4.14	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1401/1496	3.70	4.50	4.49	4.50	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1023/1498	4.70	4.77	4.75	4.77	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	4.31	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	1232/1494	3.90	4.29	4.37	4.41	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	309/1352	4.56	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	822/1248	4.00	3.93	4.23	4.39	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.07	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.32	4.45	4.61	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 484 01

Title: Biomedical Engineering

Instructor: Castellanos, Mar

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 13

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	239/906	4.50	4.20	4.13	4.28	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Course-Section: ENCH 485L 01

Title: Biochem Engineering Lab

Instructor: Good, Theresa

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 15

	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	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	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	578/1560	4.57	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	534/1559	4.57	4.28	4.31	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	967/1371	4.17	4.20	4.38	4.46	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	93/1519	4.93	4.36	4.27	4.33	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1075/1452	3.88	4.19	4.18	4.25	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	123/1430	4.85	4.23	4.16	4.25	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	378/1539	4.64	4.24	4.23	4.21	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	363/1560	4.93	4.80	4.64	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	332/1545	4.58	4.19	4.14	4.21	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	782/1496	4.57	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	937/1498	4.75	4.77	4.75	4.77	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	963/1496	4.29	4.31	4.37	4.40	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	825/1494	4.43	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1352	****	4.13	4.12	4.16	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1060/1248	3.56	3.93	4.23	4.39	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1117/1250	3.67	4.07	4.39	4.55	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1054/1239	3.89	4.32	4.45	4.61	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	****	4.20	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 485L 01

Title: Biochem Engineering Lab

Instructor: Good, Theresa

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	15/206	4.89	4.48	4.25	4.48	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/214	4.56	4.09	4.31	4.37	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	155/204	4.33	4.38	4.52	4.39	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.54	4.44	4.49	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	31/199	4.78	4.48	4.27	4.42	4.78

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENCH 489 01

Title: Spec Topics Envr Engr

Instructor: Ghosh, Upal

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 17

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	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	5	7	4.58	566/1560	4.58	4.50	4.35	4.45	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	942/1559	4.25	4.28	4.31	4.34	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	887/1371	4.25	4.20	4.38	4.46	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1060/1519	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	782/1452	4.18	4.19	4.18	4.25	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	840/1430	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.25	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	1227/1539	3.83	4.24	4.23	4.21	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	639/1545	4.33	4.19	4.14	4.21	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1047/1496	4.36	4.50	4.49	4.50	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	556/1498	4.91	4.77	4.75	4.77	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	972/1496	4.27	4.31	4.37	4.40	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	788/1494	4.45	4.29	4.37	4.41	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	823/1352	4.00	4.13	4.12	4.16	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	679/1248	4.25	3.93	4.23	4.39	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1154/1250	3.50	4.07	4.39	4.55	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	812/1239	4.33	4.32	4.45	4.61	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	360/906	4.33	4.20	4.13	4.28	4.33

Course-Section: ENCH 489 01

Title: Spec Topics Envr Engr

Instructor: Ghosh, Upal

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 17

<u> </u>	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean 10 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 * 11 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 * 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 * 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 * 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 * 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 * 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 *							structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/206	****	4.48	4.25	4.48	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.09	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.54	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.48	4.27	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 489 01

Title: Spec Topics Envr Engr

Instructor: Ghosh, Upal

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 12

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 630 01

Title: Transport Phenomena

Instructor: Frey, Douglas D

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 7

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	578/1560	4.57	4.50	4.35	4.37	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	534/1559	4.57	4.28	4.31	4.29	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	549/1371	4.57	4.20	4.38	4.37	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1519	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	670/1452	4.29	4.19	4.18	4.23	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	427/1430	4.50	4.23	4.16	4.28	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	283/1539	4.71	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	574/1560	4.86	4.80	4.64	4.72	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	406/1545	4.50	4.19	4.14	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	559/1496	4.71	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	704/1498	4.86	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	963/1496	4.29	4.31	4.37	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	825/1494	4.43	4.29	4.37	4.31	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	449/1352	4.43	4.13	4.12	3.99	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.93	4.23	4.28	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1132/1250	3.60	4.07	4.39	4.49	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1142/1239	3.60	4.32	4.45	4.57	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	239/906	4.50	4.20	4.13	4.08	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: ENCH 630 01

Title: Transport Phenomena

Instructor: Frey, Douglas D

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.09	4.31	3.86	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/204	****	4.38	4.52	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.89	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	Α	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	4	Major	2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	5	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				1	0	Other	0					
				?	2							

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:28:19 PM

Course-Section: ENCH 640 01

Title: Adv Chem Reactn Kinetics

Instructor: Marten, Mark R

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 8

	Frequencies					Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	983/1560	4.25	4.50	4.35	4.37	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1068/1559	4.13	4.28	4.31	4.29	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	887/1371	4.25	4.20	4.38	4.37	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1060/1519	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/1452	4.88	4.19	4.18	4.23	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	889/1430	4.00	4.23	4.16	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	713/1539	4.38	4.24	4.23	4.26	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1195/1560	4.38	4.80	4.64	4.72	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.19	4.14	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	710/1496	4.63	4.50	4.49	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1132/1498	4.63	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	700/1496	4.50	4.31	4.37	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	583/1494	4.63	4.29	4.37	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	963/1352	3.88	4.13	4.12	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.93	4.23	4.28	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1250	4.88	4.07	4.39	4.49	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	292/1239	4.88	4.32	4.45	4.57	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	188/906	4.60	4.20	4.13	4.08	4.60

Course-Section: ENCH 640 01

Title: Adv Chem Reactn Kinetics

Instructor: Marten, Mark R

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 8

		Frequencies					Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.23	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.28	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.07	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.88	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.89	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.06	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	3.98	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.66	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	3.99	****

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	3	Major	3	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	4							