

Course Section: ENCE 489B 0101
 Title ENV BIOLOGICAL PROCESS
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 665
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	2	8	4.50	590/1669	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.15	4.19	4.22	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	392/1421	4.67	3.61	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	10	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.11	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	492/1555	4.33	3.74	4.00	4.08	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	453/1543	4.45	4.45	4.06	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	862/1647	4.25	4.21	4.12	4.14	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	840/1605	4.11	3.99	4.07	4.16	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	489/1514	4.73	3.89	4.39	4.45	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.75	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	765/1503	4.36	4.29	4.24	4.27	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	809/1506	4.36	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	333/1311	4.40	4.25	3.85	3.88	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	445/1490	4.50	3.72	4.05	4.26	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	478/1489	4.71	4.43	4.29	4.52	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006	4.80	4.77	4.00	4.21	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.33	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.25	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.00	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.75	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	2.00	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: ENCE 489B 0101
 Title ENV BIOLOGICAL PROCESS
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 665
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENCE 489P 0101
 Title ENV PHYSIOCHEMICAL PRO
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 666
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	1	2	3.67	1409/1669	3.67	4.27	4.23	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1466/1666	3.50	4.15	4.19	4.22	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1332/1421	3.17	3.61	4.24	4.38	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	1584/1617	2.60	4.11	4.15	4.22	2.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1326/1555	3.33	3.74	4.00	4.08	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.45	4.06	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1353/1647	3.60	4.21	4.12	4.14	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	3.99	4.07	4.16	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	3.89	4.39	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.83	4.75	4.66	4.73	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1213/1311	2.60	4.25	3.85	3.88	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1288/1490	3.20	3.72	4.05	4.26	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	920/1502	4.20	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1318/1489	3.40	4.43	4.29	4.52	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	4.77	4.00	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ENCE 616 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL ENG LAB
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 667
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.27	4.23	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	984/1666	4.17	4.15	4.19	4.19	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	****	3.61	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.11	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1555	4.80	3.74	4.00	4.07	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.45	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.21	4.12	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	3.89	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.83	4.75	4.66	4.72	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.29	4.24	4.22	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.25	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	764/1490	4.17	3.72	4.05	4.18	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1502	4.50	4.68	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.43	4.29	4.44	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.77	4.00	4.11	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	116/ 226	4.33	4.33	4.20	4.47	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	114/ 233	4.25	4.25	4.19	4.41	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	209/ 225	3.75	3.75	4.50	4.65	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	146/ 223	4.25	4.25	4.35	4.48	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	117/ 206	4.00	4.00	4.15	4.39	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	3.75	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	2.00	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	4	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	0			

Course Section: ENCE 701C 0101
 Title GRADUATE SEMINAR
 Instructor: WELTY, CLAIRE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 668
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	4.25	914/1669	4.25	4.27	4.23	4.35	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	881/1666	4.25	4.15	4.19	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	3.61	4.24	4.33	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.11	4.15	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1521/1555	2.50	3.74	4.00	4.07	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.45	4.06	4.27	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.21	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.99	4.07	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1501/1514	2.00	3.89	4.39	4.37	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1304/1551	4.33	4.75	4.66	4.72	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.22	4.26	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.25	3.85	3.89	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.72	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.68	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	4.77	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	93/ 112	3.75	3.75	4.38	4.39	3.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	100/ 105	2.00	2.00	4.20	4.23	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 3	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4 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 0 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 3		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		