

Course-Section: ENCE 489C 0101
 Title ENVIRNMNTL FATE TRNSPT
 Instructor: GWO, JINPING
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 603
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	820/1199	3.75	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.67

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	2	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	3	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCE 489R 0101
 Title ENV RISK ASSESS AND RE
 Instructor: GHOSH, UPAL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 604
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	609/1504	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	478/1290	4.53	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	459/1421	4.36	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1121/1504	4.47	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	710/1483	4.18	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.18

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	239/1425	4.87	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	539/1418	4.53	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	527/1199	4.21	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.21

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.17	****

Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****

Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major 5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENCE 701C 0101
 Title GRADUATE ENVIR SEMINAR
 Instructor: WELTY, CLAIRE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 605
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	4.20	5.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	4.04	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	5.00

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.54	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.17	4.17	4.15	5.00

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.28	4.53	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.38	4.60	4.75	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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