

Course-Section: ENCH 225 01  
 Title Chem Eng Prob Solving  
 Instructor: Marten,Mark R  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 582  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	7	9	4.56	518/1447	4.42	4.42	4.31	4.31	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	532/1447	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	734/1241	4.32	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	645/1402	4.13	4.23	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	626/1358	4.12	4.12	4.11	4.12	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	549/1316	4.09	4.07	4.14	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	632/1427	4.06	4.11	4.19	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1042/1447	4.65	4.61	4.69	4.70	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	679/1434	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.97	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1118/1387	4.19	4.44	4.46	4.42	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	919/1387	4.58	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1018/1386	4.04	4.22	4.32	4.24	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	971/1380	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.25	3.62	4.02	4.04	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	282/1172	4.33	3.91	4.15	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.51	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	576/1170	4.39	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	3.46	4.06	4.01	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	124/ 189	3.98	4.21	4.34	4.47	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	1	0	5	5	3.77	166/ 192	3.38	3.81	4.34	4.38	3.77
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	155/ 186	4.04	4.25	4.48	4.57	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	171/ 187	3.15	3.65	4.33	4.46	3.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	124/ 168	3.48	3.65	4.20	4.15	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 225 04  
 Title Chem Eng Prob Solving  
 Instructor: Marten,Mark R  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 583  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	1	15	11	4.29	839/1447	4.42	4.42	4.31	4.31	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	8	9	3.79	1217/1447	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	14	4.32	726/1241	4.32	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	5	11	7	3.88	1088/1402	4.13	4.23	4.24	4.24	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	6	9	10	4.00	799/1358	4.12	4.12	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	4	10	8	3.84	944/1316	4.09	4.07	4.14	4.08	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	8	12	6	3.75	1164/1427	4.06	4.11	4.19	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	852/1447	4.65	4.61	4.69	4.70	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	3	11	8	3.92	956/1434	4.07	4.07	4.10	3.97	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	10	11	4.24	1055/1387	4.19	4.44	4.46	4.42	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	1179/1387	4.58	4.81	4.73	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	7	11	4.00	1047/1386	4.04	4.22	4.32	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	8	12	4.28	858/1380	4.21	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	3	2	3	7	2	3.18	1057/1193	3.25	3.62	4.02	4.04	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	710/1172	4.33	3.91	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	621/1182	4.51	4.38	4.35	4.30	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	745/1170	4.39	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	21	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 800	4.75	3.46	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	1	3	11	7	3.72	169/ 189	3.98	4.21	4.34	4.47	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	3	6	7	6	3	3.00	183/ 192	3.38	3.81	4.34	4.38	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	2	2	9	10	3.92	167/ 186	4.04	4.25	4.48	4.57	3.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	2	6	3	6	3	5	2.91	180/ 187	3.15	3.65	4.33	4.46	2.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	5	5	4	6	5	3.04	166/ 168	3.48	3.65	4.20	4.15	3.04

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENCH 427 01  
 Title Trans Proc II:Mass Tra  
 Instructor: Bayles,Taryn M  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 584  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	3	0	1	1	5	14	15	4.14	980/1447	4.14	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	8	15	10	3.86	1168/1447	3.86	4.24	4.27	4.31	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	8	10	13	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.36	4.33	4.41	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	13	10	9	3.88	1094/1402	3.88	4.23	4.24	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	7	5	15	6	3.39	1217/1358	3.39	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	8	10	6	6	3.26	1223/1316	3.26	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	803/1447	4.77	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	7	12	10	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	12	20	4.53	769/1387	4.53	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	6	26	4.68	970/1387	4.68	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	12	11	9	3.76	1188/1386	3.76	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	4	8	8	12	3.71	1185/1380	3.71	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	18	2	3	0	6	2	3.23	1044/1193	3.23	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	5	2	8	5	2	2.86	1123/1172	2.86	3.91	4.15	4.25	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	3	7	3	7	3.45	1092/1182	3.45	4.38	4.35	4.49	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	3	2	6	7	3	3.24	1120/1170	3.24	4.25	4.38	4.51	3.24
4. Were special techniques successful	18	11	3	4	1	1	1	2.30	788/ 800	2.30	3.46	4.06	4.19	2.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 34	Graduate 1	Major 34
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 11	General 0	Under-grad 38	Non-major 5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D 1			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 4			

Course-Section: ENCH 440 02  
 Title Chem Engineering Kinet  
 Instructor: Castellanos,Mar  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 585  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	3	17	16	4.30	829/1447	4.30	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	8	17	9	3.92	1132/1447	3.92	4.24	4.27	4.31	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	11	10	13	3.84	1034/1241	3.84	4.36	4.33	4.41	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	7	14	13	4.06	943/1402	4.06	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	12	18	4.31	551/1358	4.31	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	0	6	7	8	3.71	1026/1316	3.71	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	1	5	8	11	8	3.61	1228/1427	3.61	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	3	14	18	4.43	1139/1447	4.43	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	6	0	9	13	7	3.43	1269/1434	3.43	4.07	4.10	4.17	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	9	11	12	3.94	1207/1387	3.94	4.44	4.46	4.48	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	7	22	4.44	1179/1387	4.44	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	7	11	8	8	3.50	1258/1386	3.50	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	13	6	9	3.52	1243/1380	3.52	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	22	3	0	5	1	3	3.08	1077/1193	3.08	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	5	5	3	9	2	2.92	1116/1172	2.92	3.91	4.15	4.25	2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	6	9	3	5	3.21	1127/1182	3.21	4.38	4.35	4.49	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	1	5	6	7	3.59	1035/1170	3.59	4.25	4.38	4.51	3.59
4. Were special techniques successful	14	12	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	3.46	4.06	4.19	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 30	Graduate 1	Major 35
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	8	C 10	General	0	Under-grad 36
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			Non-major 2
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 3			

Course-Section: ENCH 442 01  
 Title Chem Engineering Sys A  
 Instructor: Smith,Jeffrey M  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 586  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	4	3	4.25	869/1447	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	853/1447	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	799/1358	3.74	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	196/1316	4.23	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	971/1427	4.03	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.94	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	431/1434	4.16	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	970/1387	4.35	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	4.78	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	539/1386	4.41	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	739/1380	4.50	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1188/1193	2.30	3.62	4.02	4.00	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 442 02  
 Title Chem Engineering Sys A  
 Instructor: Smith,Jeffrey M  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 587  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	1	8	9	4.32	810/1447	4.28	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	6	4.26	843/1447	4.26	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	8	3	3.47	1182/1358	3.74	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	8	4	3.74	1008/1316	4.23	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	942/1427	4.03	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.61	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	996/1434	4.16	4.07	4.10	4.17	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	931/1387	4.35	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1090/1387	4.78	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	879/1386	4.41	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	593/1380	4.50	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	927/1193	2.30	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 446 02  
 Title Proc Engineering Econ  
 Instructor: Castellanos,Mar  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 588  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	5	19	4.79	265/1447	4.79	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	12	4.38	715/1447	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	634/1241	4.43	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	114/1402	4.88	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	14	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	9	9	3.96	1024/1427	3.96	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	1147/1447	4.42	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	850/1387	4.45	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	11	9	4.33	811/1386	4.33	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	7	8	3.90	1104/1380	3.90	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	493/1193	4.24	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 22	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major 4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 1					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 4					

Course-Section: ENCH 450 01  
 Title Chem Process Developme  
 Instructor: Rudesill,John A  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 589  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	3	10	4.77	298/1447	4.77	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	413/1447	4.62	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1241	4.85	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	441/1358	4.42	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	512/1316	4.38	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	422/1427	4.54	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.44	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	122/1386	4.92	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	186/1193	4.67	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 1	Major 10	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				



Course-Section: ENCH 459 01  
 Title Stat Design Experiment  
 Instructor: Loehe, Joseph R  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 590  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	1	8	4.70	375/1447	4.70	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	797/1402	4.22	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	280/1358	4.60	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	617/1316	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.61	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	754/1434	4.14	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	521/1387	4.70	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	1128/1386	3.90	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1185/1380	3.70	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	3	0	1	4	3.75	843/1193	3.75	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 484 01  
 Title Biomedical Engineering  
 Instructor: Leach,Jennie B  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 591  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	3	15	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	272/1241	4.76	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	409/1358	4.44	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	342/1316	4.56	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	181/1427	4.78	4.11	4.19	4.20	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	374/1434	4.47	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	120/1387	4.94	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	317/1387	4.94	4.81	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	82/1386	4.94	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	186/1193	4.67	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 1	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ENCH 485 01  
 Title Biochem Engineering La  
 Instructor: Rao, Govind  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 592  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	9	4.90	148/1447	4.90	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	426/1447	4.60	4.24	4.27	4.31	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	186/1241	4.86	4.36	4.33	4.41	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.78	4.23	4.24	4.34	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.07	4.14	4.27	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1291/1427	3.40	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	803/1447	4.78	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	431/1434	4.43	4.07	4.10	4.17	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.44	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	171/1386	4.88	4.22	4.32	4.34	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	520/1380	4.63	4.15	4.32	4.34	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	224/1193	4.60	3.62	4.02	4.00	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1172	****	3.91	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.38	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.25	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	58/ 189	4.67	4.21	4.34	4.74	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	59/ 192	4.67	3.81	4.34	4.61	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	71/ 186	4.67	4.25	4.48	4.72	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	73/ 187	4.67	3.65	4.33	4.59	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	107/ 168	4.00	3.65	4.20	4.53	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENCH 489 01  
 Title Spec Topics Envr Engr  
 Instructor: LaKind, Judy S  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 593  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	2	2	4.20	927/1447	4.20	4.42	4.31	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1210/1447	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.31	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1197/1241	3.20	4.36	4.33	4.41	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1343/1402	3.20	4.23	4.24	4.34	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	987/1358	3.80	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1134/1316	3.50	4.07	4.14	4.27	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1291/1427	3.40	4.11	4.19	4.20	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1018/1447	4.60	4.61	4.69	4.72	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1407/1434	2.50	4.07	4.10	4.17	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1253/1387	3.80	4.44	4.46	4.48	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1306/1386	3.20	4.22	4.32	4.34	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1270/1380	3.40	4.15	4.32	4.34	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	3.62	4.02	4.00	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.75	3.91	4.15	4.25	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	720/ 800	3.25	3.46	4.06	4.19	3.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 630 01  
 Title Transport Phenomena  
 Instructor: Bayles, Taryn M  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 594  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	1	2	3	4.00	1058/1447	4.00	4.42	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	457/1447	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.30	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	323/1241	4.71	4.36	4.33	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.23	4.24	4.29	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	709/1358	4.14	4.12	4.11	4.26	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1134/1316	3.50	4.07	4.14	4.34	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.11	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.61	4.69	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	701/1434	4.20	4.07	4.10	4.21	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.44	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	539/1386	4.57	4.22	4.32	4.43	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.15	4.32	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	288/1193	4.50	3.62	4.02	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	925/1172	3.67	3.91	4.15	4.32	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.25	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	3.46	4.06	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENCH 640 01  
 Title Adv Chem Reactn Kineti  
 Instructor: Good,Theresa  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 595  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	5	1	3.88	1182/1447	3.88	4.42	4.31	4.46	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	683/1241	4.38	4.36	4.33	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	891/1402	4.13	4.23	4.24	4.29	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	952/1358	3.86	4.12	4.11	4.26	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	738/1316	4.13	4.07	4.14	4.34	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	632/1427	4.38	4.11	4.19	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1430/1447	3.57	4.61	4.69	4.74	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.07	4.10	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1235/1387	3.88	4.44	4.46	4.51	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1030/1387	4.63	4.81	4.73	4.81	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	988/1386	4.13	4.22	4.32	4.43	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	786/1193	3.86	3.62	4.02	4.02	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	377/1172	4.50	3.91	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.25	4.38	4.52	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	3.46	4.06	4.10	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 6 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 2 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		