

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 225 01
Title:	Chem Eng Prob Solving
Instructor:	Enszer, Joshua A

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	15	25	4.59	536/1542	4.59	4.51	4.33	4.35	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	26	4.54	578/1542	4.54	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	16	22	4.44	660/1339	4.44	4.42	4.32	4.40	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	12	22	4.32	790/1498	4.32	4.29	4.26	4.31	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	3	8	15	12	3.95	931/1428	3.95	4.04	4.12	4.17	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	18	17	4.32	619/1407	4.32	4.22	4.15	4.14	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	5	5	28	4.54	485/1521	4.54	4.26	4.20	4.22	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	413/1541	4.95	4.76	4.70	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	1	15	13	4.41	481/1518	4.41	4.11	4.11	4.12	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	13	26	4.60	690/1472	4.60	4.47	4.46	4.53	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	430/1475	4.93	4.70	4.72	4.79	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	14	22	4.40	785/1471	4.40	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	14	21	4.38	834/1470	4.38	4.31	4.33	4.40	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	4	1	5	20	6	3.64	1005/1310	3.64	3.84	4.06	4.19	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	4	12	7	4.04	760/1210	4.04	4.03	4.18	4.18	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	550/1211	4.54	4.07	4.37	4.34	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	676/1207	4.46	4.24	4.41	4.40	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	453/859	4.11	4.11	4.08	4.07	4.11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 225 01
Title:	Chem Eng Prob Solving
Instructor:	Enszer, Joshua A

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	55
Questionnaires:	42

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	2	1	3	6	9	3.90	140/207	3.90	3.60	4.12	4.26	3.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	3	5	7	6	3.76	162/210	3.76	3.57	4.17	4.32	3.76
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	3	6	3	9	3.86	191/202	3.86	3.74	4.50	4.62	3.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	3	0	4	6	8	3.76	177/202	3.76	3.26	4.32	4.20	3.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	1	2	4	6	8	3.86	138/199	3.86	3.55	4.15	4.32	3.86
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	4.33	4.60	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	4.33	4.50	4.34	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	40
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 412 1
Title:	Env Physicochemical Proc
Instructor:	Blaney, Lee

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	18	4.78	285/1542	4.78	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	10	4.39	765/1542	4.39	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	13	8	4.13	919/1339	4.13	4.42	4.32	4.44	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	9	7	3.91	1149/1498	3.91	4.29	4.26	4.35	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	473/1428	4.43	4.04	4.12	4.22	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	9	6	3.82	1045/1407	3.82	4.22	4.15	4.30	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	734/1521	4.35	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	721/1518	4.22	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	791/1472	4.52	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	269/1475	4.95	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	785/1471	4.40	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	438/1470	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	475/1310	4.35	3.84	4.06	4.09	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1210	****	4.03	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1211	****	4.07	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1207	****	4.24	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 412 1
Title:	Env Physicochemical Proc
Instructor:	Blaney, Lee

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	19	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	4.11	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	2	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1 C 3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8 D 0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	10	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 427 01
Title:	Trans Proc II:Mass Tran
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	26	4.81	260/1542	4.81	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	441/1542	4.65	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	22	4.65	434/1339	4.65	4.42	4.32	4.44	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	1	8	16	4.24	864/1498	4.24	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	7	19	4.29	588/1428	4.29	4.04	4.12	4.22	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	5	5	14	3.96	913/1407	3.96	4.22	4.15	4.30	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	7	19	4.42	644/1521	4.42	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	853/1541	4.81	4.76	4.70	4.72	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	349/1518	4.54	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	240/1472	4.89	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	26	4.93	430/1475	4.93	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	24	4.81	268/1471	4.81	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	349/1470	4.78	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	14	2	0	3	0	7	3.83	905/1310	3.83	3.84	4.06	4.09	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	892/1210	3.82	4.03	4.18	4.34	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	631/1211	4.45	4.07	4.37	4.47	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	2	0	8	4.27	805/1207	4.27	4.24	4.41	4.53	4.27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 427 01
Title:	Trans Proc II:Mass Tran
Instructor:	Bayles,Taryn M

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	20	4	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/859	****	4.11	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	2
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 440 01
Title:	Chem Engineering Kinetics
Instructor:	Ross, Julia M

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	27	4.90	169/1542	4.90	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	11	19	4.63	454/1542	4.63	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	10	18	4.53	550/1339	4.53	4.42	4.32	4.44	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	10	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	464/1498	4.58	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	3	4	20	4.54	363/1428	4.54	4.04	4.12	4.22	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	208/1407	4.71	4.22	4.15	4.30	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	408/1521	4.60	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	276/1541	4.97	4.76	4.70	4.72	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	373/1518	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	288/1472	4.85	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	430/1475	4.93	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	359/1471	4.74	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	438/1470	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	536/1310	4.30	3.84	4.06	4.09	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1210	****	4.03	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1211	****	4.07	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1207	****	4.24	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 440 01
Title:	Chem Engineering Kinetcs
Instructor:	Ross,Julia M

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	29	1	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/859	****	4.11	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	7
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 442 01
Title:	Chem Engineering Sys Anl
Instructor:	Smith,Jeffrey M

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	11	12	4.46	706/1542	4.46	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	879/1542	4.29	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	497/1339	4.58	4.42	4.32	4.44	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	464/1498	4.58	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	0	5	3	8	3.55	1211/1428	3.55	4.04	4.12	4.22	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	757/1407	4.19	4.22	4.15	4.30	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	8	10	4.00	1046/1521	4.00	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	842/1518	4.10	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	7	11	4.27	1072/1472	4.27	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	951/1475	4.73	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	6	13	4.36	833/1471	4.36	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	543/1470	4.64	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1271/1310	2.67	3.84	4.06	4.09	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1210	****	4.03	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1211	****	4.07	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1207	****	4.24	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 442 01
Title:	Chem Engineering Sys Anl
Instructor:	Smith,Jeffrey M

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	43
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	4.11	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1 A 13	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	3
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 446 01
Title:	Proc Engineering Econ II
Instructor:	Castellanos,Mar

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	8	24	4.70	397/1542	4.70	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	6	10	14	4.09	1082/1542	4.09	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	25	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/1339	****	4.42	4.32	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	333/1498	4.69	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	431/1428	4.47	4.04	4.12	4.22	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	12	17	4.41	530/1407	4.41	4.22	4.15	4.30	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	9	8	10	3.66	1262/1521	3.66	4.26	4.20	4.24	3.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.88	738/1541	4.88	4.76	4.70	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	205/1518	4.72	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	8	17	4.50	817/1472	4.50	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	592/1475	4.89	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	938/1471	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	4	6	13	3.96	1137/1470	3.96	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	1	1	9	13	4.42	414/1310	4.42	3.84	4.06	4.09	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1210	****	4.03	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1211	****	4.07	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1207	****	4.24	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 446 01
Title:	Proc Engineering Econ II
Instructor:	Castellanos,Mar

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	39
Questionnaires:	34

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	31	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/859	****	4.11	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	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				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 450 01
Title:	Chem Process Development
Instructor:	Rudesill,John A

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	9	8	4.19	1025/1542	4.19	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	10	6	3.90	1208/1542	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	10	9	4.24	841/1339	4.24	4.42	4.32	4.44	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	11	6	4.10	1007/1498	4.10	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	7	4	3.55	1211/1428	3.55	4.04	4.12	4.22	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	8	7	4.00	874/1407	4.00	4.22	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	1021/1521	4.05	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	345/1541	4.95	4.76	4.70	4.72	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	7	6	6	3.85	1093/1518	3.85	4.11	4.11	4.18	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	885/1472	4.45	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	1053/1475	4.65	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	6	6	6	3.75	1245/1471	3.75	4.28	4.32	4.36	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	8	5	3.75	1237/1470	3.75	4.31	4.33	4.38	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	2	4	5	3	3.18	1192/1310	3.18	3.84	4.06	4.09	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1210	****	4.03	4.18	4.34	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1211	****	4.07	4.37	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1207	****	4.24	4.41	4.53	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 450 01
Title:	Chem Process Development
Instructor:	Rudesill,John A

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/859	****	4.11	4.08	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 8	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 7
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 8	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 485L 01
Title:	Biochem Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	1	2	6	2	3.21	1481/1542	3.21	4.51	4.33	4.42	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	2	7	2	0	2.57	1527/1542	2.57	4.24	4.29	4.33	2.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1334/1498	3.54	4.29	4.26	4.35	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	4	2	2	2	3.00	1360/1428	3.00	4.04	4.12	4.22	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1340/1407	3.08	4.22	4.15	4.30	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	1	4	4	0	2.62	1490/1521	2.62	4.26	4.20	4.24	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1536/1541	3.23	4.76	4.70	4.72	3.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	2	2	5	3	0	2.75	1471/1518	2.75	4.11	4.11	4.18	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1439/1472	3.00	4.47	4.46	4.50	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1469/1475	3.00	4.70	4.72	4.74	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	2	4	0	1	2.56	1452/1471	2.56	4.28	4.32	4.36	2.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1466/1470	1.88	4.31	4.33	4.38	1.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	1297/1310	2.29	3.84	4.06	4.09	2.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1197/1210	2.40	4.03	4.18	4.34	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1125/1211	3.40	4.07	4.37	4.47	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1172/1207	3.00	4.24	4.41	4.53	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/859	****	4.11	4.08	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	187/207	3.29	3.60	4.12	4.41	3.29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 485L 01
Title:	Biochem Engineering Lab
Instructor:	Leach,Jennie B

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	198/210	3.38	3.57	4.17	4.02	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	197/202	3.63	3.74	4.50	4.42	3.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	197/202	2.75	3.26	4.32	4.23	2.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	188/199	3.25	3.55	4.15	3.77	3.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 489 01
Title:	Spec Topics Envr Engr
Instructor:	Ghosh,Upal

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	322/1542	4.56	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1060/1542	4.13	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	982/1339	4.06	4.42	4.32	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1258/1498	4.02	4.29	4.26	4.35	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	629/1428	3.91	4.04	4.12	4.22	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	559/1407	4.19	4.22	4.15	4.30	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	696/1521	4.06	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1191/1541	4.59	4.76	4.70	4.72	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1129/1518	3.71	4.11	4.11	4.18	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	817/1472	4.56	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1092/1475	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	821/1471	4.13	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	374/1470	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	546/1310	4.27	3.84	4.06	4.09	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	711/1210	4.24	4.03	4.18	4.34	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1008/1211	3.55	4.07	4.37	4.47	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	800/1207	3.77	4.24	4.41	4.53	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	589/859	3.80	4.11	4.08	4.19	3.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 489 01
Title:	Spec Topics Envr Engr
Instructor:	Ghosh,Upal

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/210	****	3.57	4.17	4.02	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	3.74	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/202	****	3.26	4.32	4.23	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/199	****	3.55	4.15	3.77	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	58/69	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.62	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	55/69	4.33	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	47/68	4.33	4.33	4.50	4.65	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	57/73	4.00	4.00	4.54	4.72	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	36/67	4.33	4.33	4.17	4.37	4.33
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	3.50	3.50	4.36	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	4.00	4.00	4.59	4.56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/23	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.33	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	3.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	2.67	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 489 01
Title:	Spec Topics Envr Engr
Instructor:	Ghosh,Upal

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 489 02
Title:	Spec Topics Envr Engr
Instructor:	Welty,Claire

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	4.38	818/1542	4.56	4.51	4.33	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1060/1542	4.13	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	927/1339	4.06	4.42	4.32	4.44	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	767/1498	4.02	4.29	4.26	4.35	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1203/1428	3.91	4.04	4.12	4.22	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	874/1407	4.19	4.22	4.15	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1219/1521	4.06	4.26	4.20	4.24	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	906/1541	4.59	4.76	4.70	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1236/1518	3.71	4.11	4.11	4.18	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	659/1472	4.56	4.47	4.46	4.50	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	619/1475	4.75	4.70	4.72	4.74	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1191/1471	4.13	4.28	4.32	4.36	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	960/1470	4.50	4.31	4.33	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	576/1310	4.27	3.84	4.06	4.09	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	578/1210	4.24	4.03	4.18	4.34	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1144/1211	3.55	4.07	4.37	4.47	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1155/1207	3.77	4.24	4.41	4.53	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/859	3.80	4.11	4.08	4.19	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 489 02
Title:	Spec Topics Envr Engr
Instructor:	Welty,Claire

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	3.60	4.12	4.41	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/32	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.39	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	29/35	3.50	3.50	4.36	4.25	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	20/25	4.00	4.00	4.59	4.56	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	18/23	4.00	4.00	4.41	4.33	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.70	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 630 01
Title:	Transport Phenomena
Instructor:	Frey,Douglas D

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	10	4.75	322/1542	4.75	4.51	4.33	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	129/1542	4.92	4.24	4.29	4.31	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	224/1339	4.83	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.29	4.26	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	318/1428	4.58	4.04	4.12	4.13	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.22	4.15	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	231/1521	4.75	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	620/1541	4.92	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	433/1518	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.15	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	209/1472	4.91	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.70	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	163/1471	4.90	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	311/1470	4.80	4.31	4.33	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	425/1310	4.40	3.84	4.06	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	373/1210	4.60	4.03	4.18	4.28	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	682/1211	4.40	4.07	4.37	4.51	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	344/1207	4.80	4.24	4.41	4.53	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 630 01
Title:	Transport Phenomena
Instructor:	Frey,Douglas D

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	216/859	4.50	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 640 01
Title:	Adv Chem Reactn Kinetics
Instructor:	Marten,Mark R

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	11	4.71	372/1542	4.71	4.51	4.33	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	892/1542	4.29	4.24	4.29	4.31	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	801/1339	4.29	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	392/1498	4.64	4.29	4.26	4.25	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	390/1428	4.50	4.04	4.12	4.13	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	828/1407	4.10	4.22	4.15	4.20	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	330/1521	4.67	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	906/1541	4.75	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	433/1518	4.45	4.11	4.11	4.15	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	553/1472	4.69	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1475	5.00	4.70	4.72	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	463/1471	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	257/1470	4.85	4.31	4.33	4.34	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	262/1310	4.58	3.84	4.06	3.99	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	384/1210	4.58	4.03	4.18	4.28	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	352/1211	4.75	4.07	4.37	4.51	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	402/1207	4.75	4.24	4.41	4.53	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	111/859	4.78	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 640 01
Title:	Adv Chem Reactn Kinetics
Instructor:	Marten,Mark R

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 4
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 662 01
Title:	Gmp's For Bioprocesses
Instructor:	Moreira, Antonio

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	4.45	706/1542	4.45	4.51	4.33	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	684/1542	4.45	4.24	4.29	4.31	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	926/1498	4.18	4.29	4.26	4.25	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	985/1428	3.91	4.04	4.12	4.13	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	365/1407	4.55	4.22	4.15	4.20	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	99/1521	4.91	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	445/1518	4.03	4.11	4.11	4.15	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	503/1472	4.36	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	781/1475	4.69	4.70	4.72	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	500/1471	4.43	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	543/1470	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	642/1310	3.81	3.84	4.06	3.99	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	696/1210	4.17	4.03	4.18	4.28	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	918/1211	4.00	4.07	4.37	4.51	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	499/1207	4.67	4.24	4.41	4.53	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	607/859	3.75	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 662 01
Title:	Gmp's For Bioprocesses
Instructor:	Moreira, Antonio

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	5.00	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.50	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.00	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.00	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 662 01
Title:	Gmp's For Bioprocesses
Instructor:	Lubiniecki,Anth

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	4.45	706/1542	4.45	4.51	4.33	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	684/1542	4.45	4.24	4.29	4.31	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	476/1339	4.60	4.42	4.32	4.31	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	926/1498	4.18	4.29	4.26	4.25	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	985/1428	3.91	4.04	4.12	4.13	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	365/1407	4.55	4.22	4.15	4.20	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	99/1521	4.91	4.26	4.20	4.24	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1541	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1236/1518	4.03	4.11	4.11	4.15	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1222/1472	4.36	4.47	4.46	4.48	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1158/1475	4.69	4.70	4.72	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	969/1471	4.43	4.28	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	960/1470	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1093/1310	3.81	3.84	4.06	3.99	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	696/1210	4.17	4.03	4.18	4.28	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	918/1211	4.00	4.07	4.37	4.51	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	499/1207	4.67	4.24	4.41	4.53	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	607/859	3.75	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	ENCH 662 01
Title:	Gmp's For Bioprocesses
Instructor:	Lubiniecki,Anth

Term - Spring 2012

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/32	****	5.00	4.20	4.06	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	3.50	4.36	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	4.00	4.59	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	4.00	4.41	4.39	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/17	****	****	4.62	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.27	4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/19	****	****	4.57	4.45	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.29	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.25	4.35	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.14	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

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