

Course-Section: ENCH 215 0101  
 Title CHEM ENGINEERING ANALY  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 652  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	14	4.68	404/1639	4.68	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	496/1639	4.53	4.22	4.22	4.27	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	632/1397	4.42	4.13	4.28	4.39	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	929/1583	4.12	4.25	4.19	4.28	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	366/1532	4.47	3.79	4.01	4.09	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	701/1504	4.17	4.13	4.05	4.09	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	743/1612	4.32	4.10	4.16	4.21	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	979/1635	4.68	4.82	4.65	4.63	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	427/1579	4.46	4.15	4.08	4.14	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	575/1518	4.68	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.68	4.70	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	875/1517	4.26	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	489/1550	4.63	4.35	4.22	4.33	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1138/1295	3.14	3.87	3.94	4.07	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	599/1398	4.29	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	950/1391	4.07	4.05	4.30	4.35	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	771/1388	4.36	4.28	4.28	4.37	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	2	1	1	3	0	2.71	900/ 958	2.71	3.54	3.93	4.00	2.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 215H 0101  
 Title CHEM ENGR ANALYSIS-HON  
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 653  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.46	4.27	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.22	4.22	4.27	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	417/1397	4.60	4.13	4.28	4.39	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.25	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1184/1532	3.60	3.79	4.01	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.13	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.10	4.16	4.21	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.82	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.15	4.08	4.14	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.35	4.22	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.87	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	625/1398	4.25	3.77	4.07	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.05	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.28	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.54	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 300 0101  
 Title CHEM PROC THERMODYNAMICS  
 Instructor: CASTELLANOS, MA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 654  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	10	13	4.35	806/1639	4.35	4.46	4.27	4.28	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	11	9	6	3.81	1326/1639	3.81	4.22	4.22	4.20	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	11	8	6	3.73	1185/1397	3.73	4.13	4.28	4.26	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	7	7	3.69	1303/1583	3.69	4.25	4.19	4.24	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	9	9	3.92	883/1532	3.92	3.79	4.01	4.05	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	12	8	3	3.44	1240/1504	3.44	4.13	4.05	4.12	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	8	7	3.84	1221/1612	3.84	4.10	4.16	4.12	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	869/1635	4.77	4.82	4.65	4.66	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	9	9	7	3.92	1022/1579	3.92	4.15	4.08	4.07	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	9	11	4.29	1061/1518	4.29	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	979/1520	4.71	4.68	4.70	4.68	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	11	8	4	3.63	1304/1517	3.63	4.12	4.27	4.23	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	9	7	8	3.96	1119/1550	3.96	4.35	4.22	4.20	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	17	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/1295	****	3.87	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	7	2	5	3.21	1219/1398	3.21	3.77	4.07	4.13	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	8	3	5	3.47	1228/1391	3.47	4.05	4.30	4.35	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	918/1388	4.11	4.28	4.28	4.34	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	830/ 958	3.13	3.54	3.93	3.97	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	25
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENCH 425 0101  
 Title TRANSPORT I:FLUIDS  
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 655  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	7	21	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.46	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.13	4.28	4.38	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	871/1583	4.17	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	6	5	4	7	3	2.84	1467/1532	2.84	3.79	4.01	4.07	2.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	758/1504	4.12	4.13	4.05	4.20	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	7	17	4.39	644/1612	4.39	4.10	4.16	4.18	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	781/1635	4.82	4.82	4.65	4.72	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	14	10	4.31	601/1579	4.31	4.15	4.08	4.21	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	6	11	8	3.96	1269/1518	3.96	4.47	4.43	4.51	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	802/1520	4.81	4.68	4.70	4.75	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	12	9	4.08	1042/1517	4.08	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	556/1550	4.58	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	19	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1295	****	3.87	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	****	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.05	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1388	****	4.28	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.54	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENCH 437L 0101  
 Title CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L  
 Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 656  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	4	11	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.46	4.27	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	633/1639	4.44	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1397	****	4.13	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	355/1583	4.63	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.79	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.13	4.05	4.20	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	8	7	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.10	4.16	4.18	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.94	4.82	4.65	4.72	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1170/1579	4.04	4.15	4.08	4.21	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	575/1518	4.69	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.68	4.70	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	2	12	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	769/1550	4.40	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	337/1295	4.42	3.87	3.94	4.01	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	839/1391	4.22	4.05	4.30	4.48	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	3.54	3.93	4.24	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	33/ 224	4.75	4.75	4.10	4.49	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	56/ 240	4.67	4.67	4.11	4.26	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	114/ 219	4.56	4.56	4.44	4.42	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	128/ 215	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	86/ 198	4.33	4.33	4.18	4.21	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.75	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	3.83	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.50	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ENCH 437L 0101  
 Title CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L  
 Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 656  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 437L 0101  
 Title CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L  
 Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 657  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	4	11	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.46	4.27	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	633/1639	4.44	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1397	****	4.13	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	355/1583	4.63	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.79	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.13	4.05	4.20	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	8	7	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.10	4.16	4.18	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.94	4.82	4.65	4.72	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	569/1579	4.04	4.15	4.08	4.21	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1518	4.69	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1520	4.88	4.68	4.70	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1517	4.50	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1550	4.40	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1295	4.42	3.87	3.94	4.01	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.77	4.07	4.23	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	839/1391	4.22	4.05	4.30	4.48	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	3.54	3.93	4.24	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	33/ 224	4.75	4.75	4.10	4.49	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	56/ 240	4.67	4.67	4.11	4.26	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	114/ 219	4.56	4.56	4.44	4.42	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	128/ 215	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	86/ 198	4.33	4.33	4.18	4.21	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.75	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	3.83	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.50	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.50	****	

Course-Section: ENCH 437L 0101  
 Title CHEMICAL ENGINEERING L  
 Instructor: LEACH, JENNIE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 657  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 444 0101  
 Title PROCESS ENGINEERING EC  
 Instructor: OGUNTMEIN, GBE  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 658  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	5	7	7	3	3.17	1583/1639	3.17	4.46	4.27	4.42	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	2	8	3	3	2.63	1621/1639	2.63	4.22	4.22	4.29	2.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	5	7	5	4	3.08	1355/1397	3.08	4.13	4.28	4.38	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	9	6	5	3.52	1398/1583	3.52	4.25	4.19	4.31	3.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	8	4	5	3.45	1270/1532	3.45	3.79	4.01	4.07	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	4	10	2	3	2.83	1443/1504	2.83	4.13	4.05	4.20	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	10	4	5	1	3	2.26	1590/1612	2.26	4.10	4.16	4.18	2.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	1	0	2	19	4.61	1067/1635	4.61	4.82	4.65	4.72	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	5	3	6	2	1	2.47	1556/1579	2.47	4.15	4.08	4.21	2.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	8	7	4	3.33	1449/1518	3.33	4.47	4.43	4.51	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	11	5	4	3.33	1504/1520	3.33	4.68	4.70	4.75	3.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	10	7	2	3	2.75	1488/1517	2.75	4.12	4.27	4.34	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	6	5	4	3	2.67	1483/1550	2.67	4.35	4.22	4.24	2.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	5	2	4	4	4	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.87	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1398	****	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1391	****	4.05	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1388	****	4.28	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.54	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.75	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.67	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	4.56	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	4.33	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	4.33	4.18	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.60	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.75	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	3.83	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	4.50	4.69	4.85	****	

Course-Section: ENCH 444 0101  
 Title PROCESS ENGINEERING EC  
 Instructor: OGUNTIMEIN, GBE  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 658  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENCH 445 0101  
 Title SEPARATION PROCESSES  
 Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 659  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	21	4.95	86/1639	4.95	4.46	4.27	4.42	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	231/1639	4.77	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	223/1397	4.82	4.13	4.28	4.38	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	669/1583	4.36	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	6	8	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.79	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	560/1504	4.31	4.13	4.05	4.20	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	8	13	4.45	561/1612	4.45	4.10	4.16	4.18	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	869/1635	4.76	4.82	4.65	4.72	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	262/1579	4.64	4.15	4.08	4.21	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	107/1518	4.95	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	273/1520	4.95	4.68	4.70	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	347/1517	4.71	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	698/1295	3.94	3.87	3.94	4.01	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1398	****	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/1391	****	4.05	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1388	****	4.28	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.54	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 482 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMICAL ENGINEERIN  
 Instructor: MARTEN, MARK  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 660  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	8	4.54	582/1639	4.54	4.46	4.27	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	404/1639	4.62	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	342/1397	4.69	4.13	4.28	4.38	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	598/1532	4.23	3.79	4.01	4.07	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	780/1504	4.08	4.13	4.05	4.20	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	376/1612	4.62	4.10	4.16	4.18	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	968/1635	4.69	4.82	4.65	4.72	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	427/1579	4.46	4.15	4.08	4.21	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	770/1518	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	992/1520	4.69	4.68	4.70	4.75	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1162/1517	3.92	4.12	4.27	4.34	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	603/1550	4.54	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.87	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	460/1398	4.46	3.77	4.07	4.23	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.05	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	684/1388	4.46	4.28	4.28	4.50	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 958	****	3.54	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 486 0101  
 Title SURVEY SENSORS & INSTR  
 Instructor: RAO, GOVIND  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 661  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	9	4.62	495/1639	4.62	4.46	4.27	4.42	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.22	4.22	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1131/1397	3.83	4.13	4.28	4.38	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	584/1583	4.42	4.25	4.19	4.31	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1104/1532	3.70	3.79	4.01	4.07	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.13	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1294/1612	3.73	4.10	4.16	4.18	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.92	4.82	4.65	4.72	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.15	4.08	4.21	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	872/1520	4.77	4.68	4.70	4.75	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	560/1517	4.54	4.12	4.27	4.34	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	690/1550	4.46	4.35	4.22	4.24	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	421/1295	4.30	3.87	3.94	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1398	****	3.77	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	****	4.05	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1388	****	4.28	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.54	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0101  
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO  
 Instructor: MOREIRA, ANTONI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 662  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	1	6	6	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.46	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	4	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.22	4.22	4.26	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1268/1397	3.50	4.13	4.28	4.37	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1192/1583	3.86	4.25	4.19	4.31	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1270/1532	3.45	3.79	4.01	4.10	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	603/1504	4.27	4.13	4.05	4.29	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	860/1612	4.21	4.10	4.16	4.27	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	463/1635	4.93	4.82	4.65	4.81	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	835/1579	4.09	4.15	4.08	4.17	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	863/1518	4.47	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	1033/1520	4.67	4.68	4.70	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.12	4.27	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.35	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	505/1295	4.20	3.87	3.94	3.95	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	0	5	2	2	2.85	1319/1398	2.85	3.77	4.07	4.22	2.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	4	1	5	3.38	1252/1391	3.38	4.05	4.30	4.47	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1116/1388	3.69	4.28	4.28	4.49	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	****	3.54	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.67	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	50/ 85	4.60	4.60	4.58	4.58	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	43/ 82	4.60	4.60	4.52	4.74	4.60	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 78	4.83	4.83	4.47	4.52	4.83	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	40/ 52	3.50	3.50	4.04	3.64	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	40/ 53	3.75	3.75	4.05	4.03	3.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	43/ 50	3.83	3.83	4.45	4.39	3.83	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	31/ 43	4.50	4.50	4.69	4.61	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: ENCH 660 0101  
 Title REGULATORY ISS BIO  
 Instructor: MOREIRA, ANTONI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 662  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	7	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	8	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						