

Course-Section: ENCE 612 01  
 Title Environ Physicochem Pr  
 Instructor: Reed,Brian E  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 576  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1339/1447	3.50	4.08	4.31	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1215/1241	3.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1392/1402	2.50	4.11	4.24	4.29	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1251/1358	3.25	3.85	4.11	4.26	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1257/1316	3.00	4.10	4.14	4.34	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1164/1427	3.75	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1419/1447	3.75	4.43	4.69	4.74	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1389/1434	2.75	3.65	4.10	4.21	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1039/1387	4.25	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	879/1386	4.25	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	3.95	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	999/1172	3.50	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1121/1182	3.25	4.04	4.35	4.46	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1163/1170	2.50	3.58	4.38	4.52	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	795/ 800	2.00	2.00	4.06	4.10	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCE 658 01  
 Title Modeling/Urban Envir  
 Instructor: Swan,Christophe (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 577  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	849/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	719/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	739/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	867/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	2.00	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 4	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	Under-grad 3	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives		
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		
				? 0			

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

Course-Section: ENCE 658 01  
 Title Modeling/Urban Envir  
 Instructor: Farrow,Robert S (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 578  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1031/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	855/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	971/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	867/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	2.00	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCE 658 01  
 Title Modeling/Urban Envir  
 Instructor: Neerchal,Nagara (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 579  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1238/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1105/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1243/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	936/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	2.00	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCE 658 01  
 Title Modeling/Urban Envir  
 Instructor: Welty,Claire (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 580  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1297/1447	3.57	3.80	4.27	4.30	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	923/1241	4.00	3.80	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	735/1402	4.29	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	799/1358	4.00	3.85	4.11	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.10	4.14	4.34	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1110/1427	3.86	4.03	4.19	4.25	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.71	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	733/1434	3.88	3.65	4.10	4.21	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.54	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.82	4.84	4.73	4.81	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	539/1386	4.21	4.35	4.32	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.36	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	867/1193	3.68	3.95	4.02	4.02	3.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.69	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	856/1182	4.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	2.00	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCE 701 01  
 Title Spec Topics Enviro Eng  
 Instructor: Welty,Claire  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 581  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.08	4.31	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	3.80	4.27	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.11	4.24	4.29	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.10	4.14	4.34	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.03	4.19	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.43	4.69	4.74	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.54	4.46	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.35	4.32	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.36	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	3.95	4.02	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.00	3.69	4.15	4.32	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.04	4.35	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1137/1170	3.00	3.58	4.38	4.52	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.79	5.00	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	5.00	4.42	4.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.85	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.65	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
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	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						