

Course-Section: ENCE 489R 0101
 Title ENV RISK ASSESS AND RE
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 627
 JUN 26, 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	0	2	3	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.60	4.30	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.40	4.26	4.34	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	425/1285	4.60	4.10	4.30	4.42	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.10	4.22	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.50	4.06	4.11	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	434/1381	4.40	4.20	4.08	4.21	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.60	4.65	4.71	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.33	4.11	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	682/1440	4.60	4.40	4.45	4.52	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.90	4.71	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.80	4.28	4.29	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	758/1432	4.40	4.60	4.29	4.34	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	359/1221	4.40	4.45	3.93	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	4.50	3.88	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.25	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.00	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	2.67	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Title ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTR
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

JUN 26, 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	492/1522	4.60	4.60	4.30	4.45	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1142/1285	3.60	4.10	4.30	4.31	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1281/1476	3.60	4.10	4.22	4.31	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1412	4.60	4.50	4.06	4.25	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.20	4.08	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.60	4.60	4.65	4.73	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.33	4.11	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1094/1440	4.20	4.40	4.45	4.48	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1212/1436	3.75	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.60	4.29	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.45	3.93	3.83	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1133/1280	3.25	3.88	4.10	4.24	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.50	4.25	4.34	4.52	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.00	4.31	4.51	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	824/ 854	2.67	2.67	4.02	4.08	2.67

Frequency Distribution

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