

Course-Section: ENCE 489B 0101
 Title ENV BIOLOGICAL PROCESS
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 670
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.63	4.28	4.50	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648	4.40	3.97	4.23	4.36	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.53	4.27	4.48	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.66	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1533	4.80	4.57	4.04	4.14	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	310/1512	4.60	4.15	4.10	4.26	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.47	4.16	4.27	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.85	4.69	4.71	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.50	3.96	4.06	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.54	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.69	4.70	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.27	4.28	4.40	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	966/1559	4.25	4.31	4.29	4.41	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.16	3.98	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.18	4.08	4.35	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	3.63	4.29	4.56	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.75	3.58	4.30	4.58	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.58	3.95	4.31	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	45/ 221	4.67	4.67	4.16	4.73	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 243	4.75	4.75	4.12	4.61	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	86/ 212	4.67	4.67	4.40	4.57	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	72/ 209	4.67	4.67	4.35	4.63	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/ 555	4.67	4.67	4.29	4.41	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.66	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	62/ 85	4.25	4.63	4.47	4.54	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 81	4.75	3.38	4.43	4.57	4.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.30	4.35	4.44	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.63	3.68	3.71	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	21/ 52	4.75	4.75	4.06	4.86	4.75	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	21/ 48	4.25	4.25	4.09	4.42	4.25	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	25/ 39	4.25	4.25	4.47	4.52	4.25	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	24/ 39	4.25	4.25	4.38	4.59	4.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	50/ 312	4.25	4.25	3.68	3.95	4.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/ 53	4.67	4.67	4.30	4.64	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	9/ 30	4.50	4.50	4.16	4.24	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	21/ 41	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.84	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	14/ 24	4.50	4.50	4.42	4.85	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	12/ 110	4.67	4.67	3.99	4.22	4.67	

Course-Section: ENCE 489B 0101
 Title ENV BIOLOGICAL PROCESS
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 670
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCE 489G 0101
 Title GROUNDWATER HYDROLOGY
 Instructor: WELTY, CLAIRE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 671
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.63	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	3.97	4.23	4.36	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.53	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.66	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.57	4.04	4.14	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.47	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.96	4.06	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.69	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.41	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1380/1384	1.00	3.18	4.08	4.35	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1378/1382	1.00	3.63	4.29	4.56	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1365/1368	1.00	3.58	4.30	4.58	1.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENCE 610 0101
 Title ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMISTR
 Instructor: REED, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 672
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	2	3	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.63	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	797/1648	4.33	3.97	4.23	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.53	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.66	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.57	4.04	4.28	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.15	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.47	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.69	4.70	4.83	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.31	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	879/1352	3.80	4.16	3.98	4.10	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1122/1384	3.40	3.18	4.08	4.30	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	869/1382	4.20	3.63	4.29	4.52	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	4.40	3.58	4.30	4.56	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.58	3.95	4.03	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.75	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	4.67	4.40	4.73	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.67	4.35	4.80	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.67	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCE 701C 0101
 Title GRADUATE SEMINAR
 Instructor: WELTY, CLAIRE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 673
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.63	4.28	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1580/1648	3.14	3.97	4.23	4.34	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.66	4.20	4.35	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.57	4.04	4.28	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1055/1512	3.86	4.15	4.10	4.35	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.47	4.16	4.29	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	3.96	4.06	4.20	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.83	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.27	4.28	4.41	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.31	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.16	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	921/1384	3.83	3.18	4.08	4.30	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.83	3.63	4.29	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	891/1368	4.17	3.58	4.30	4.56	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.63	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	81/ 81	2.00	3.38	4.43	4.43	2.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	35/ 92	4.60	4.30	4.35	4.42	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 288	4.75	4.63	3.68	3.87	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	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	3	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	4						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						