

Course-Section: ENCE 489R 0101
 Title ENV RISK ASSESS AND RE
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 603
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	925/1481	4.14	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.07	3.98	4.09	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1039/1342	3.67	4.12	4.07	4.21	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1086/1459	3.86	4.19	4.16	4.25	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	533/ 788	3.75	4.03	4.00	4.26	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 3 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 6 Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENCE 610 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTR
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 604
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	1	1	0	2.75	1473/1481	2.75	4.26	4.29	4.28	2.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1475/1481	2.25	4.26	4.23	4.11	2.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1218/1249	2.75	4.37	4.27	4.24	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1423/1424	2.25	4.27	4.21	4.16	2.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.12	4.07	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.19	4.16	4.01	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1429/1450	2.50	4.10	4.09	3.96	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1395/1409	2.50	4.46	4.42	4.36	2.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1344/1407	3.75	4.77	4.69	4.73	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1363/1399	2.75	4.30	4.26	4.16	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1312/1400	3.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1114/1179	2.67	3.94	3.96	3.81	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1223/1262	2.50	4.18	4.05	4.07	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1226/1259	2.50	4.40	4.29	4.30	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1246/1256	2.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	4.03	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	241/ 242	2.00	4.45	4.40	4.27	2.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	3.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 605
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	3	1	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.27	4.21	4.16	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1459	4.75	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	4.07	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.66	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.26	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 63	4.50	4.24	4.44	4.44	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 69	4.67	4.19	4.35	4.16	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	32/ 68	4.33	3.98	3.92	3.71	4.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	3.90	4.55	4.38	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.50	4.83	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.50	4.82	5.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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