

Course-Section: ENCH 225 0101
 Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 606
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 3.96 | 1143/1504 | 3.96 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.96 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 3.75 | 1207/1503 | 3.75 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 3.96 | 979/1290 | 3.96 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 3.96 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 4.22 | 821/1453 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.20 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3.00 | 1305/1421 | 3.00 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.90 | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 4.04 | 759/1365 | 4.04 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.04 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 4.04 | 969/1485 | 4.04 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.04 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 4.08 | 1389/1504 | 4.08 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.08 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 3.84 | 1051/1483 | 4.09 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.09 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 3.29 | 1340/1425 | 3.29 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 3.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4.50 | 1128/1426 | 4.33 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.33 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 3.25 | 1307/1418 | 3.54 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 3.54 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 3.85 | 1122/1416 | 3.84 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.24 | 3.84 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 3.94 | 714/1199 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.95 | 3.94 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.67 | 947/1312 | 3.67 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 3.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 737/1303 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 922/1299 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.75 | 176/ 233 | 3.75 | 4.07 | 4.09 | 4.30 | 3.75 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 3.00 | 224/ 244 | 3.00 | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 3.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 179/ 227 | 4.00 | 4.49 | 4.40 | 4.58 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.17 | 146/ 225 | 4.17 | 4.40 | 4.23 | 4.52 | 4.17 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.00 | 106/ 207 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.09 | 4.22 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | 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 | 21 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Title CHEM ENG PROB SOLVING
 Instructor: GOOD, THERESA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 3.96 | 1143/1504 | 3.96 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.96 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 3.75 | 1207/1503 | 3.75 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.75 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 3.96 | 979/1290 | 3.96 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.27 | 3.96 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 4.22 | 821/1453 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.20 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3.00 | 1305/1421 | 3.00 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 3.90 | 3.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 4.04 | 759/1365 | 4.04 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.04 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 4.04 | 969/1485 | 4.04 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.15 | 4.04 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 4.08 | 1389/1504 | 4.08 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.08 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 543/1483 | 4.09 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.02 | 4.09 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | ****/1425 | 3.29 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.40 | 3.29 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 1296/1426 | 4.33 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.71 | 4.33 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.83 | 1128/1418 | 3.54 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 3.54 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.83 | 1131/1416 | 3.84 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.24 | 3.84 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | ****/1199 | 3.94 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 3.95 | 3.94 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3.67 | 947/1312 | 3.67 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 3.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 4.33 | 737/1303 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.23 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 922/1299 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 3.89 | **** |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3.75 | 176/ 233 | 3.75 | 4.07 | 4.09 | 4.30 | 3.75 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 3.00 | 224/ 244 | 3.00 | 4.12 | 4.09 | 4.24 | 3.00 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4.00 | 179/ 227 | 4.00 | 4.49 | 4.40 | 4.58 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.17 | 146/ 225 | 4.17 | 4.40 | 4.23 | 4.52 | 4.17 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.00 | 106/ 207 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.09 | 4.22 | 4.00 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 14 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 6 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 9 | 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 | 21 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Title TRANS PROC II:MASS TRA
 Instructor: BAYLES, TARYN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 16 | 4.44 | 639/1504 | 4.44 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 4.32 | 765/1503 | 4.32 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.32 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 7 | 3.92 | 1005/1290 | 3.92 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 3.92 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 3.86 | 1129/1453 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 3.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 4.00 | 745/1421 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3.89 | 909/1365 | 3.89 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 3.89 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 4.39 | 602/1485 | 4.39 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 4.39 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 4.86 | 726/1504 | 4.86 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 4.86 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 4.47 | 373/1483 | 4.47 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.47 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 14 | 4.54 | 736/1425 | 4.54 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 4.54 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4.73 | 878/1426 | 4.73 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.73 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 4.00 | 1013/1418 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 4.17 | 937/1416 | 4.17 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3.56 | 901/1199 | 3.56 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 3.56 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3.90 | 814/1312 | 3.90 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.90 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3.90 | 992/1303 | 3.90 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.34 | 3.90 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.00 | 922/1299 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.38 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.17 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 4.60 | 4.61 | 4.63 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 70 | **** | 4.54 | 4.35 | 4.63 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 67 | **** | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.34 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 4.41 | 4.44 | 4.51 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 73 | **** | 4.17 | 4.17 | 4.29 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 58 | **** | 3.98 | 4.43 | 4.83 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 56 | **** | 4.12 | 4.23 | 4.37 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 44 | **** | 4.68 | 4.65 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 47 | **** | 4.32 | 4.29 | 4.12 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | 4.61 | 4.44 | 4.19 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 7 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 10 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 24 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 15 | 3.00-3.49 | 11 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |

Title CHEM ENGINEERING KINET
 Instructor: ROSS, JULIA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.56 | 482/1504 | 4.56 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 4.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 4.22 | 880/1503 | 4.22 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.22 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 4.00 | 937/1290 | 4.00 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 3.82 | 1155/1453 | 3.82 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 3.82 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 13 | 4.39 | 429/1421 | 4.39 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 4.39 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4.06 | 754/1365 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 4.06 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 4.11 | 926/1485 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 4.11 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 691/1504 | 4.89 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 4.89 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3.87 | 1030/1483 | 3.87 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.87 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.67 | 572/1425 | 4.67 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 4.56 | 1089/1426 | 4.56 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.56 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 4.39 | 727/1418 | 4.39 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.39 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 8 | 4.17 | 945/1416 | 4.17 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.50 | 919/1199 | 3.50 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1312 | **** | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1303 | **** | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.34 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/1299 | **** | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.38 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.17 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 2 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 9 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 4 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 20 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 6 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 13 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title RXN KINETICS IN BIOENG
 Instructor: ROSS, JULIA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3.18 | 1429/1504 | 3.18 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 3.18 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.91 | 1136/1503 | 3.91 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.91 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/1290 | **** | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3.70 | 1214/1453 | 3.70 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 3.70 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.50 | 1113/1421 | 3.50 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 3.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.33 | 1225/1365 | 3.33 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 3.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.18 | 842/1485 | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 4.18 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 580/1483 | 4.30 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.30 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4.40 | 900/1425 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 790/1426 | 4.78 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 772/1418 | 4.33 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.33 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 921/1416 | 4.20 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 177/1199 | 4.67 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 4.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 465/1312 | 4.40 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 507/1303 | 4.60 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.34 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 303/1299 | 4.80 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.38 | 4.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 304/ 758 | 4.25 | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.17 | 4.25 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 124/ 233 | 4.20 | 4.07 | 4.09 | 3.78 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 178/ 244 | 3.80 | 4.12 | 4.09 | 3.56 | 3.80 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 102/ 227 | 4.60 | 4.49 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.60 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 225 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.23 | 3.81 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 207 | **** | 4.22 | 4.09 | 3.69 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Title CHEM ENGINEERING SYS A
 Instructor: SMITH, JEFFREY
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.31 | 813/1504 | 4.31 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 4.31 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 4.31 | 780/1503 | 4.31 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.31 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.25 | 783/1290 | 4.25 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.27 | 764/1453 | 4.27 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.27 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3.38 | 1189/1421 | 3.38 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 3.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.31 | 514/1365 | 4.31 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 4.31 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 3.81 | 1140/1485 | 3.81 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 3.81 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 4.19 | 1322/1504 | 4.19 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 4.19 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3.93 | 961/1483 | 3.93 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.93 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.31 | 991/1425 | 4.31 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 4.31 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.50 | 1128/1426 | 4.50 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.06 | 993/1418 | 4.06 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.06 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 4.06 | 1008/1416 | 4.06 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.06 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3.50 | 919/1199 | 3.50 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 3.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/1312 | **** | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1303 | **** | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.34 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/1299 | **** | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.38 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 12 | 3.00-3.49 | 8 | 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 | 14 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: ENCH 446 0101

University of Maryland

Page 612

Title PROC ENGINEERING ECON
 Instructor: KELLER, DAVID G
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.63 | 396/1504 | 4.63 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.25 | 848/1503 | 4.25 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.64 | 378/1290 | 4.64 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 4.64 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4.50 | 440/1453 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.50 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.18 | 1262/1421 | 3.18 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 3.18 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3.93 | 878/1365 | 3.93 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 3.93 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 4.13 | 914/1485 | 4.13 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 4.33 | 1221/1504 | 4.33 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 4.33 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 4.14 | 751/1483 | 4.14 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.14 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.63 | 634/1425 | 4.63 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.63 | 1022/1426 | 4.63 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.63 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 4.38 | 736/1418 | 4.38 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.38 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 4.75 | 324/1416 | 4.75 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3.62 | 880/1199 | 3.62 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 3.62 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/1312 | **** | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/1303 | **** | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.34 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/1299 | **** | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.38 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.17 | **** |

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 | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 0 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 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 | 14 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Title BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING
 Instructor: OWENS, CAMELIA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3.64 | 1309/1504 | 3.64 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 3.64 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 3.21 | 1388/1503 | 3.21 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 3.21 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.64 | 1116/1290 | 3.64 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 3.64 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 3.86 | 1136/1453 | 3.86 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 3.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.31 | 1222/1421 | 3.31 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 3.31 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 3.79 | 981/1365 | 3.79 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 3.79 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3.64 | 1230/1485 | 3.64 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 3.64 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 4.29 | 1255/1504 | 4.29 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 4.29 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 3.25 | 1327/1483 | 3.25 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 3.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 4.14 | 1105/1425 | 4.14 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.00 | 1319/1426 | 4.00 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3.14 | 1320/1418 | 3.14 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 3.14 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 3.93 | 1085/1416 | 3.93 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 3.93 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | ****/1199 | **** | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | **** |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/1312 | **** | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1303 | **** | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.34 | **** |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/1299 | **** | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.38 | **** |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.17 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 4.60 | 4.61 | 4.63 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 70 | **** | 4.54 | 4.35 | 4.63 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 67 | **** | 4.32 | 4.34 | 4.34 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 4.41 | 4.44 | 4.51 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 73 | **** | 4.17 | 4.17 | 4.29 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Title BIOCHEM ENGINEERING LA
 Instructor: RAO, GOVIND
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 168/1504 | 4.86 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4.00 | 1052/1503 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1155/1290 | 3.50 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.32 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 741/1453 | 4.29 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.40 | 1397/1421 | 2.40 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.02 | 2.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4.43 | 395/1365 | 4.43 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.09 | 4.43 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.83 | 1482/1485 | 1.83 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.14 | 1.83 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 850/1483 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.11 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 1257/1425 | 3.75 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.38 | 3.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | 1183/1426 | 4.43 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.72 | 4.43 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 1013/1418 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | 1401/1416 | 2.00 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 2.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3.00 | 1050/1199 | 3.00 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.05 | 3.00 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 56/ 233 | 4.60 | 4.07 | 4.09 | 3.78 | 4.60 |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.71 | 187/ 244 | 3.71 | 4.12 | 4.09 | 3.56 | 3.71 |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 50/ 227 | 4.86 | 4.49 | 4.40 | 4.16 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 95/ 225 | 4.57 | 4.40 | 4.23 | 3.81 | 4.57 |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2.71 | 205/ 207 | 2.71 | 4.22 | 4.09 | 3.69 | 2.71 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Title TRANSPORT PHENOMENA
 Instructor: FREY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4.13 | 1029/1504 | 4.13 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3.88 | 1150/1503 | 3.88 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.28 | 3.88 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3.63 | 1123/1290 | 3.63 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 3.63 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 844/1453 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 745/1421 | 4.00 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 645/1365 | 4.20 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.20 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 914/1485 | 4.13 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.13 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1504 | 5.00 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4.00 | 850/1483 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 224/1425 | 4.88 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 572/1426 | 4.88 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.80 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3.75 | 1163/1418 | 3.75 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 3.75 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.88 | 1112/1416 | 3.88 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.38 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.75 | 820/1199 | 3.75 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.04 | 3.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 716/1312 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 910/1303 | 4.00 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.58 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.33 | 1258/1299 | 2.33 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.56 | 2.33 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Title ADV CHEM REACTN KINETI
 Instructor: MARTEN, MARK
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | 1403/1504 | 3.33 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 3.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1052/1503 | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 1155/1290 | 3.50 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4.20 | 844/1453 | 4.20 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 4.20 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4.40 | 410/1421 | 4.40 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 297/1365 | 4.50 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.60 | 349/1485 | 4.60 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.60 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.50 | 1501/1504 | 2.50 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 2.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1093/1483 | 3.80 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 3.80 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4.40 | 900/1425 | 4.40 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.40 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 1128/1426 | 4.50 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.80 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3.60 | 1225/1418 | 3.60 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 3.60 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.83 | 1348/1416 | 2.83 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.38 | 2.83 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 1050/1199 | 3.00 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.04 | 3.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3.83 | 858/1312 | 3.83 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 3.83 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.17 | 851/1303 | 4.17 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.58 | 4.17 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.83 | 1025/1299 | 3.83 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.56 | 3.83 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.24 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Title BIOTECH FAC DESIGN
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|---|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 183/1504 | 4.83 | 4.24 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 751/1503 | 4.33 | 4.22 | 4.20 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 937/1290 | 4.00 | 4.32 | 4.28 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.60 | 1253/1453 | 3.60 | 4.22 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 3.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 479/1421 | 4.33 | 4.08 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 493/1365 | 4.33 | 4.11 | 4.08 | 4.35 | 4.33 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 290/1485 | 4.67 | 4.20 | 4.16 | 4.24 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 983/1504 | 4.67 | 4.68 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 850/1483 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.06 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 665/1425 | 4.60 | 4.41 | 4.41 | 4.51 | 4.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1426 | 5.00 | 4.72 | 4.69 | 4.80 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4.00 | 1013/1418 | 4.00 | 4.29 | 4.25 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 255/1416 | 4.80 | 4.34 | 4.26 | 4.38 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 129/1199 | 4.75 | 3.95 | 3.97 | 4.04 | 4.75 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4.20 | 632/1312 | 4.20 | 4.12 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 910/1303 | 4.00 | 4.39 | 4.24 | 4.58 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.20 | 834/1299 | 4.20 | 4.34 | 4.25 | 4.56 | 4.20 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 758 | **** | 4.05 | 4.01 | 4.24 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 76 | **** | 4.60 | 4.61 | 4.57 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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