

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 202  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17	4.06	1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19	3.91	1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11	3.54	1208/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5	3.03	1511/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20	4.06	1012/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	6	24	8	4.00	918/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	8	33	4.62	647/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	36	4.78	843/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	11	17	17	4.13	987/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	16	23	4.36	809/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	15	23	4.32	405/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13	3.79	1016/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20	4.02	1005/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9	3.36	1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	6	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1	1.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 202  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 203  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17	4.06	1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19	3.91	1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11	3.54	1208/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5	3.03	1511/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20	4.06	1012/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	3	14	16	2	3.49	1365/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	2	7	8	14	4.10	1174/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	3	5	8	14	4.10	1391/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	5	8	7	9	3.69	1269/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	4	2	5	10	8	3.55	1309/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	4	4	5	8	5	3.23	1063/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13	3.79	1016/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20	4.02	1005/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9	3.36	1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	6	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1	1.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 203  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER, J (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 204  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17	4.06	1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19	3.91	1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11	3.54	1208/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5	3.03	1511/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20	4.06	1012/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	1	4	17	9	4.10	857/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	4	10	14	4.28	1070/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	1	2	10	14	4.37	1284/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	932/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	6	10	10	4.15	988/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	4	2	5	4	5	6	3.36	1013/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13	3.79	1016/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20	4.02	1005/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9	3.36	1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	6	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1	1.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER, J (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 204  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 205  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	5	21	17	4.06	1131/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	13	11	19	3.91	1220/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	12	15	11	3.54	1208/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	7	3	6	8	5	3.03	1511/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	0	11	12	14	3.92	905/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1401/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	3	18	20	4.06	1012/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	39	4.85	825/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	4	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	877/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	1182/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1435/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1066/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1243/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	4	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	11	18	13	3.79	1016/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	3	7	15	20	4.02	1005/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.02	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	5	11	16	9	3.36	1331/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	4	4	8	13	13	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	6	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	8	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	6	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	7	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	8	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	5	0	0	0	1	1.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	2	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 205  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	16	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 206  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13	3.58	1445/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12	3.51	1466/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10	3.30	1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4	3.13	1496/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15	3.71	1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	10	15	16	14	3.40	1440/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	53	4.85	807/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	2	10	22	16	3.92	1057/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	7	11	41	4.40	964/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	10	47	4.65	1055/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	6	11	17	28	4.08	1025/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	5	9	18	29	4.16	980/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	5	9	18	28	4.10	542/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	19	16	3.63	1107/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	6	19	24	3.97	1054/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15	3.71	1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16	16	3.59	735/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.59	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 206  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	A	17	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 207  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13	3.58	1445/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12	3.51	1466/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10	3.30	1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4	3.13	1496/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15	3.71	1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	10	15	16	14	3.40	1440/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	53	4.85	807/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	1	3	32	13	1	3.20	1470/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	6	14	20	13	3.75	1324/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	4	5	23	23	4.18	1364/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	9	16	21	8	3.47	1340/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	5	18	16	10	3.53	1315/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	12	2	3	17	13	4	3.36	1018/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	19	16	3.63	1107/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	6	19	24	3.97	1054/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15	3.71	1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16	16	3.59	735/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.59	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 207  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	A	17	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 208  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13	3.58	1445/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12	3.51	1466/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10	3.30	1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4	3.13	1496/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15	3.71	1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	10	15	16	14	3.40	1440/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	53	4.85	807/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	7	1	2	11	10	2	3.38	1408/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	2	4	7	10	8	3.58	1373/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	1	7	8	14	4.06	1396/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	1	5	8	11	4	3.41	1362/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	1	2	1	11	7	7	3.57	1305/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	37	4	2	1	10	6	3	3.32	1037/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	19	16	3.63	1107/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	6	19	24	3.97	1054/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15	3.71	1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16	16	3.59	735/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.59	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 208  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	A	17	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 209  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	4	25	18	13	3.58	1445/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	10	20	20	12	3.51	1466/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	7	9	14	21	10	3.30	1300/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	25	6	6	7	15	4	3.13	1496/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	7	14	18	15	3.71	1104/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	3	4	15	6	2	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	10	15	16	14	3.40	1440/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	53	4.85	807/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	6	1	2	4	17	6	3.83	1148/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	4	1	9	12	10	3.64	1360/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	4	5	16	11	3.86	1450/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	2	3	12	13	7	3.54	1318/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	2	11	15	6	3.58	1303/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	8	3	2	9	7	5	3.35	1023/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	19	16	3.63	1107/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	7	6	19	24	3.97	1054/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	5	13	23	15	3.71	1209/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	4	7	13	16	16	3.59	735/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.59	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 209  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	3	A	17	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	62	Non-major	62
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	49				
				?	1						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 210  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	17	28	8	3.56	1458/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	11	11	21	12	3.48	1475/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	13	19	18	5	3.12	1349/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	4	13	9	10	5	2.98	1526/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	3	3	19	7	16	3.63	1163/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	5	3	8	7	3	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	10	10	17	17	3.61	1347/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	5	0	0	1	2	46	4.92	641/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	4	2	17	22	8	3.53	1348/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	6	9	36	4.24	1088/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	3	11	40	4.48	1208/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	3	11	14	22	3.82	1205/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	6	2	11	11	24	3.83	1209/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	7	5	13	11	17	3.49	944/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	8	13	17	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	7	6	10	29	3.84	1154/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	13	8	15	13	9	2.95	1417/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	9	9	6	8	19	3.37	823/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	9	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 21			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 13	General 1	Under-grad 59	Non-major 59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	46	
?	3			

Course Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 211  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	17	28	8	3.56	1458/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	11	11	21	12	3.48	1475/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	13	19	18	5	3.12	1349/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	4	13	9	10	5	2.98	1526/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	3	3	19	7	16	3.63	1163/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	5	3	8	7	3	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	10	10	17	17	3.61	1347/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	5	0	0	1	2	46	4.92	641/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	4	4	2	21	18	3	3.29	1443/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	2	5	13	13	14	3.68	1346/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	2	2	9	10	24	4.11	1391/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	2	4	15	13	7	3.46	1344/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	5	6	5	12	9	3.38	1353/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	10	9	5	6	7	7	2.94	1142/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	8	13	17	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	7	6	10	29	3.84	1154/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	13	8	15	13	9	2.95	1417/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	9	9	6	8	19	3.37	823/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	9	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 21			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 13	General 1	Under-grad 59	Non-major 59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	46	
?	3			

Course Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 212  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	17	28	8	3.56	1458/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	11	11	21	12	3.48	1475/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	13	19	18	5	3.12	1349/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	4	13	9	10	5	2.98	1526/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	3	3	19	7	16	3.63	1163/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	5	3	8	7	3	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	10	10	17	17	3.61	1347/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	5	0	0	1	2	46	4.92	641/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	7	4	3	8	11	2	3.14	1485/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	2	3	7	6	6	3.46	1398/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	37	0	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	1364/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	39	0	1	1	8	5	5	3.60	1301/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	3	4	6	5	4	3.14	1393/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	11	3	3	2	2	3	2.92	****/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	8	13	17	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	7	6	10	29	3.84	1154/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	13	8	15	13	9	2.95	1417/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	9	9	6	8	19	3.37	823/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	9	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 21			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 13	General 1	Under-grad 59	Non-major 59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	46	
?	3			

Course Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 71  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 213  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	17	28	8	3.56	1458/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	11	11	21	12	3.48	1475/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	13	19	18	5	3.12	1349/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	4	13	9	10	5	2.98	1526/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	3	3	19	7	16	3.63	1163/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	5	3	8	7	3	3.00	1410/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	10	10	17	17	3.61	1347/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	5	0	0	1	2	46	4.92	641/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	6	1	0	1	12	14	4.36	565/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	3	2	4	8	16	3.97	1227/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	2	3	9	15	4.28	1330/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	0	1	0	12	13	4.42	686/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	2	4	7	11	4.00	1069/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	6	2	2	7	6	6	3.52	929/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	8	13	17	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	6	7	6	10	29	3.84	1154/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	13	8	15	13	9	2.95	1417/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	9	9	6	8	19	3.37	823/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.37	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	9	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 21			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 13	General 1	Under-grad 59	Non-major 59
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	46	
?	3			



Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 214  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	3.93	1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15	3.81	1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10	3.42	1267/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5	3.39	1428/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	4	10	8	3	3.07	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	17	22	3.89	1169/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	45	4.82	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	14	23	10	3.84	1148/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	16	38	4.61	663/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	11	41	4.66	1028/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	9	26	18	4.00	1066/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	13	17	22	3.98	1090/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	4	8	19	26	4.18	495/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19	3.96	1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23	14	3.87	617/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.87	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 214  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	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	48				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 215  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	3.93	1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15	3.81	1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10	3.42	1267/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5	3.39	1428/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	4	10	8	3	3.07	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	17	22	3.89	1169/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	45	4.82	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	4	0	0	14	23	3	3.72	1233/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	4	20	16	4.17	1136/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	3	15	23	4.40	1270/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	12	18	10	3.83	1197/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	5	6	14	14	3.95	1132/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	8	2	5	7	12	8	3.56	914/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19	3.96	1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23	14	3.87	617/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.87	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 215  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	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	48				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 216  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	3.93	1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15	3.81	1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10	3.42	1267/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5	3.39	1428/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	4	10	8	3	3.07	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	17	22	3.89	1169/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	45	4.82	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	0	0	10	25	4	3.85	1140/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	0	9	12	16	4.03	1193/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	1	4	9	24	4.38	1279/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	0	12	12	12	3.92	1157/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	3	6	12	14	4.06	1047/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	12	1	3	5	10	7	3.73	801/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19	3.96	1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23	14	3.87	617/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.87	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 216  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	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	48				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 217  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	32	11	3.93	1253/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	19	21	15	3.81	1303/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	10	17	18	10	3.42	1267/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	2	5	14	15	5	3.39	1428/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	5	10	19	20	4.00	773/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	4	10	8	3	3.07	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	17	22	3.89	1169/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	45	4.82	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	11	0	0	13	15	1	3.59	1321/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	1	7	13	14	4.06	1185/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	2	1	5	9	20	4.19	1364/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	1	12	9	12	3.78	1225/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	1	2	7	13	12	3.94	1132/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	11	1	6	4	8	7	3.54	924/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	11	24	20	4.07	820/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	9	14	30	4.25	880/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	13	21	19	3.96	1072/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	0	15	23	14	3.87	617/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.87	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	2	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 217  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	58	Non-major	58
84-150	2	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	48				
				?	0						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 218  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14	3.76	1367/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	14	15	3.87	1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9	3.39	1280/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3	3.24	1475/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8	18	3.86	971/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6	19	3.63	1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	1	11	15	9	3.81	1164/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	10	30	4.43	908/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	5	38	4.72	954/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	8	5	17	15	3.80	1210/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	3	2	10	23	4.00	1069/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	1	7	10	23	4.11	531/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	24	4.24	701/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14	21	3.93	1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 218  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 219  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14	3.76	1367/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	14	15	3.87	1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9	3.39	1280/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3	3.24	1475/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8	18	3.86	971/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6	19	3.63	1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	1	10	17	5	3.63	1299/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	2	9	5	14	3.94	1248/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	1	2	7	24	4.49	1208/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	2	2	7	10	13	3.88	1176/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	3	3	0	10	16	4.03	1055/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	2	1	7	8	11	3.86	725/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	24	4.24	701/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14	21	3.93	1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 219  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 220  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14	3.76	1367/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	14	15	3.87	1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9	3.39	1280/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3	3.24	1475/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8	18	3.86	971/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6	19	3.63	1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	436/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	845/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	1216/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	1045/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	770/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	5	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	587/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	24	4.24	701/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14	21	3.93	1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 220  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 221  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	13	14	3.76	1367/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	13	14	15	3.87	1265/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	15	14	9	3.39	1280/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	5	12	11	3	3.24	1475/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	12	8	18	3.86	971/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	5	7	6	7	3.50	1260/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	5	11	6	19	3.63	1337/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	5	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	525/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	1042/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	1334/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	969/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	3	3	5	8	3.95	1132/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	439/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	13	24	4.24	701/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	12	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	2	2	14	21	3.93	1098/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	1	12	27	4.29	368/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 58  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 221  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 222  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7	5	5	3.21	1358/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12	984/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	11	16	6	3.74	1218/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	11	29	4.64	616/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	33	4.76	862/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	8	15	16	4.02	1055/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	7	9	21	4.23	926/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	7	6	22	4.13	525/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	14	22	4.16	764/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10	21	4.22	393/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 222  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 223  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7	5	5	3.21	1358/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12	984/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	7	20	3	3.81	1172/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	616/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	1000/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	4	9	18	4.38	753/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	13	15	4.28	884/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	3	2	3	6	17	4.03	572/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	14	22	4.16	764/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10	21	4.22	393/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 223  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 224  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7	5	5	3.21	1358/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12	984/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	737/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	522/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	788/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	519/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	1	7	14	4.43	731/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	3	0	2	3	15	4.17	495/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	14	22	4.16	764/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10	21	4.22	393/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 224  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 225  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	9	12	16	3.81	1345/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	8	18	13	3.93	1192/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	3	8	13	13	3.62	1185/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	4	3	8	9	5	3.28	1467/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	10	12	17	4.13	687/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	3	4	7	5	5	3.21	1358/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	12	20	4.12	984/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	36	4.88	769/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	0	3	14	6	4.13	820/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	892/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	1143/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	1	4	7	12	4.25	879/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	4	9	9	4.09	1033/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	4	1	0	5	10	3.80	764/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	14	22	4.16	764/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	9	29	4.49	656/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	973/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.16	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	7	10	21	4.22	393/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	3	0	0	0	4	3.29	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 225  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	41
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 226  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	27	16	3.83	1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9	3.53	1455/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13	3.47	1239/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5	3.36	1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18	3.77	1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6	3.06	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22	3.65	1331/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81	901/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	3	10	25	12	3.86	1124/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	9	46	4.63	631/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	8	48	4.70	986/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	8	14	32	4.24	896/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	8	12	34	4.20	958/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	4	3	18	28	4.09	547/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93	934/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16	944/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18	3.81	1168/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 226  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 227  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	27	16	3.83	1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9	3.53	1455/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13	3.47	1239/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5	3.36	1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18	3.77	1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6	3.06	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22	3.65	1331/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81	901/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	6	0	1	14	20	5	3.72	1233/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	2	1	6	15	22	4.17	1130/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	2	1	6	14	24	4.21	1354/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	2	10	11	21	4.09	1025/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	6	5	11	20	4.07	1038/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	5	5	1	4	11	17	3.89	705/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93	934/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16	944/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18	3.81	1168/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 227  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 228  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	27	16	3.83	1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9	3.53	1455/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13	3.47	1239/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5	3.36	1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18	3.77	1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6	3.06	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22	3.65	1331/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81	901/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	10	0	0	4	17	13	4.26	678/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	2	0	6	12	20	4.20	1118/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	2	0	7	8	25	4.29	1326/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	0	5	16	17	4.15	969/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	3	4	12	18	4.22	942/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	8	3	0	4	8	14	4.03	572/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93	934/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16	944/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18	3.81	1168/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 228  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 229  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	11	27	16	3.83	1332/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	19	25	9	3.53	1455/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	10	11	19	13	3.47	1239/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	4	4	14	18	5	3.36	1442/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	6	9	17	18	3.77	1045/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	7	7	6	3.06	1399/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	8	4	10	13	22	3.65	1331/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	11	46	4.81	901/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	6	0	0	6	14	12	4.19	769/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	2	1	4	10	17	4.15	1148/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	3	0	5	8	21	4.19	1364/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	0	5	11	14	4.19	932/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	0	2	4	9	16	4.26	909/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	5	3	1	3	8	9	3.79	769/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	13	23	18	3.93	934/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	3	8	15	29	4.16	944/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	3	8	23	18	3.81	1168/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	6	7	7	13	20	3.64	706/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	4	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	1	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0202  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 229  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	1						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 230  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8	3.79	1359/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10	3.63	1409/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10	3.59	1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12	11	7	3.44	1403/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	9	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7	2	5	5	4	2.87	1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	7	4	18	20	3.98	1066/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	731/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	0	15	18	9	3.73	1233/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	11	36	4.56	739/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	4	45	4.77	862/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	8	13	25	4.12	1005/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	8	11	28	4.24	926/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	3	12	12	19	3.96	643/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.31	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20	3.94	1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00	479/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 230  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 231  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8	3.79	1359/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10	3.63	1409/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10	3.59	1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12	11	7	3.44	1403/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	9	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7	2	5	5	4	2.87	1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	7	4	18	20	3.98	1066/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	731/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	7	1	2	8	20	6	3.76	1210/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1	3	4	10	15	4.06	1182/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	1	4	10	24	4.38	1284/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	3	5	11	16	4.06	1040/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	2	1	5	5	5	15	3.90	1174/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	12	1	3	6	2	7	3.58	904/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.31	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20	3.94	1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00	479/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 231  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 232  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8	3.79	1359/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10	3.63	1409/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10	3.59	1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12	11	7	3.44	1403/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	9	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7	2	5	5	4	2.87	1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	7	4	18	20	3.98	1066/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	731/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	8	1	2	3	9	11	4.04	897/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	2	0	1	4	16	4.39	964/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	1	0	2	5	21	4.55	1152/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	1	3	4	15	4.29	843/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	1	1	2	4	3	11	4.00	1069/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	7	2	1	5	1	6	3.53	924/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.31	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20	3.94	1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00	479/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 232  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 233  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	16	27	8	3.79	1359/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	14	21	10	3.63	1409/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	9	10	21	10	3.59	1195/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	3	12	11	7	3.44	1403/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	9	19	15	3.96	856/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	7	2	5	5	4	2.87	1470/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	7	4	18	20	3.98	1066/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	731/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	7	0	0	0	11	17	4.61	298/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	2	0	2	6	18	4.36	1003/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	3	6	23	4.52	1184/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	2	7	17	4.36	777/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	1	4	6	15	4.22	934/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	13	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1004/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	18	25	4.25	692/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	6	15	28	4.31	836/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	3	8	16	20	3.94	1090/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	13	8	25	4.00	479/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	3	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0203  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 67  
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 233  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	37				
				?	2						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 234  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11	3.42	1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18	3.64	1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18	3.57	1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5	3.00	1516/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13	3.43	1280/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2	2.83	1476/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20	3.51	1393/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	926/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	2	1	14	21	10	3.75	1210/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	3	12	39	4.51	799/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	10	42	4.63	1069/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	3	11	17	21	3.91	1168/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	3	13	7	29	4.07	1038/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	12	13	27	4.15	513/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18	14	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23	3.78	1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	6	14	15	17	3.53	1266/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42	804/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	3	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 234  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	A	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	4						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 235  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11	3.42	1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18	3.64	1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18	3.57	1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5	3.00	1516/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13	3.43	1280/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2	2.83	1476/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20	3.51	1393/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	926/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	6	1	2	24	17	1	3.33	1428/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	3	9	7	15	12	3.52	1385/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	4	9	12	23	4.06	1396/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	7	2	13	13	12	3.45	1351/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	2	7	3	11	11	9	3.29	1369/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	16	3	7	6	8	7	3.29	1045/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18	14	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23	3.78	1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	6	14	15	17	3.53	1266/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42	804/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	3	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 235  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	A	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	4						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 236  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11	3.42	1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18	3.64	1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18	3.57	1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5	3.00	1516/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13	3.43	1280/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2	2.83	1476/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20	3.51	1393/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	926/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	10	5	5	9	6	3	2.89	1527/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	5	6	6	12	6	3.23	1435/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	2	5	6	10	12	3.71	1471/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	9	4	9	9	3	2.79	1448/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	2	9	3	7	9	3	2.81	1431/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	15	2	6	2	7	2	3.05	1109/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18	14	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23	3.78	1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	6	14	15	17	3.53	1266/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42	804/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	3	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 236  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	A	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	4						

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 237  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	8	20	17	11	3.42	1516/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	7	13	17	18	3.64	1402/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	15	18	3.57	1202/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	3	11	14	7	5	3.00	1516/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	6	19	11	13	3.43	1280/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	4	6	13	5	2	2.83	1476/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	8	9	14	20	3.51	1393/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	926/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	11	0	1	6	9	8	4.00	918/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	3	5	2	8	12	3.70	1341/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	1	2	6	6	13	4.00	1404/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	5	1	4	6	13	3.72	1250/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	1	3	2	3	7	10	3.76	1239/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	8	2	3	1	8	4	3.50	939/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	18	14	12	3.29	1246/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	6	15	11	23	3.78	1196/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	6	6	14	15	17	3.53	1266/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	5	8	16	8	16	3.42	804/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	3	4	1	2	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	4	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	3	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	3	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	3	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	2	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	2	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	51	1	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0204  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 237  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	4	A	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	15						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	4						



Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 238  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11	3.63	1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11	3.76	1329/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10	3.69	1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6	3.46	1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10	3.81	1012/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3	2.96	1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8	3.37	1459/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8	38	4.77	952/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	13	24	5	3.81	1172/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	14	30	4.46	861/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	11	34	4.59	1119/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	11	21	14	3.98	1096/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	5	6	15	21	4.04	1051/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	4	5	15	19	4.00	587/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12	3.48	1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21	3.94	1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8	3.38	1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0	3.11	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	3	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 238  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 6	C 14	General 1	Under-grad 53 Non-major 53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 239  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11	3.63	1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11	3.76	1329/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10	3.69	1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6	3.46	1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10	3.81	1012/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3	2.96	1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8	3.37	1459/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8	38	4.77	952/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	1	23	13	4	3.43	1391/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	6	13	10	13	3.71	1337/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	9	15	19	4.13	1381/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	4	16	15	6	3.50	1330/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	4	15	14	6	3.38	1351/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	3	6	6	5	11	3.48	950/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12	3.48	1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21	3.94	1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8	3.38	1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0	3.11	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	3	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 239  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 6	C 14	General 1	Under-grad 53 Non-major 53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 25		
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 240  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11	3.63	1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11	3.76	1329/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10	3.69	1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6	3.46	1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10	3.81	1012/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3	2.96	1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8	3.37	1459/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8	38	4.77	952/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	4	5	6	7	4	4	2.85	1534/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	5	4	7	5	5	3.04	1454/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	4	0	7	7	13	3.81	1462/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	5	5	5	9	3	3.00	1423/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	7	4	7	6	4	2.86	1426/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	12	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	****/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12	3.48	1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21	3.94	1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8	3.38	1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0	3.11	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	3	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 240  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 6	C 14	General 1	Under-grad 53 Non-major 53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 25		
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 241  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	5	14	19	11	3.63	1427/1669	3.74	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	15	21	11	3.76	1329/1666	3.71	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	22	10	3.69	1159/1421	3.47	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	12	13	6	3.46	1398/1617	3.23	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	2	11	19	10	3.81	1012/1555	3.82	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	22	4	7	4	8	3	2.96	1430/1543	3.06	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	18	14	8	3.37	1459/1647	3.72	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	8	38	4.77	952/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	6	0	1	4	11	10	4.15	800/1605	3.80	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	1	5	8	11	4.04	1190/1514	4.12	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	1223/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	5	10	8	4.13	987/1503	3.91	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	9	7	7	3.72	1254/1506	3.89	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	5	1	3	4	2	8	3.72	807/1311	3.73	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	5	12	14	12	3.48	1172/1490	3.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	10	10	21	3.94	1085/1502	4.12	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	5	12	17	8	3.38	1324/1489	3.67	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	6	3	15	9	10	3.33	846/1006	3.74	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	1	0	5	3	0	3.11	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	3	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	3	0	1	4	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	1	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	1	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	3	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	1	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101 0205  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: DEBRACCIO, ANTH (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 241  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 6	C 14	General 1	Under-grad 53 Non-major 53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 1		



Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 242  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	993/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1095/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1372/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1497/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1007/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	864/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	986/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	969/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	1033/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	349/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	2	6	3.54	1142/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7	3.46	1294/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	2	0	4	5	3.62	723/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.62	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 243  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	993/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1095/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1372/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1497/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1007/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1274/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1270/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1404/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1261/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	3.10	1398/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	0	1	2	2	2.78	1191/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	2	6	3.54	1142/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7	3.46	1294/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	2	0	4	5	3.62	723/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.62	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 244  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	993/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1095/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1372/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1497/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1007/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	918/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1160/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1083/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	996/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	445/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	2	6	3.54	1142/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7	3.46	1294/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	2	0	4	5	3.62	723/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.62	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 245  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	938/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	993/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1095/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1372/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	558/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1497/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1007/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	473/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1326/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	852/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1277/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1072/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	2	6	3.54	1142/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	4	1	0	1	7	3.46	1294/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	2	0	4	5	3.62	723/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.62	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 246  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1371/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1466/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1516/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1321/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1172/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	955/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1270/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1210/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	286/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	219/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1036/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 246  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 247  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1371/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1466/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1516/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1321/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1455/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1270/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	932/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	770/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	587/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1036/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 247  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 248  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1371/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1466/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1516/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1321/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1036/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANNETTE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 248  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 249  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1371/1669	3.99	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1466/1666	3.83	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.67	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1516/1617	3.25	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	773/1555	4.13	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1410/1543	2.83	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1321/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	3.99	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.16	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1404/1551	4.36	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.10	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.23	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	587/1311	3.90	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1036/1490	3.64	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.23	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.81	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 101H 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR  
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER,JE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 249  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 250  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	11	6	11	3	2.89	1619/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	9	9	7	5	2.89	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	9	6	9	3.17	1332/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	6	4	6	2	2.90	1552/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	6	14	11	3.94	872/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1355/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	8	13	6	3.40	1440/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	863/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	10	5	7	8	1	2.52	1560/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	7	6	6	13	5	3.08	1450/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	6	26	4.46	1231/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	12	7	7	8	3	2.54	1469/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	17	1	10	7	1	2.28	1481/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	12	2	6	9	4	2.73	1201/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	5	5	10	5	2.76	1404/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	1	4	8	19	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	3	10	9	9	3.32	1345/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	6	2	8	8	12	3.50	759/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	1	5	1	0	1	2.38	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 251  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	11	6	11	3	2.89	1619/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	9	9	7	5	2.89	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	9	6	9	3.17	1332/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	6	4	6	2	2.90	1552/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	6	14	11	3.94	872/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1355/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	8	13	6	3.40	1440/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	863/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	3	15	8	2	3.32	1432/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	3	4	3	7	8	3.52	1385/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	3	3	3	6	11	3.73	1469/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	4	1	6	6	5	3.32	1384/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	7	3	3	6	1	2.55	1452/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	6	2	3	6	2	3	3.06	1108/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	5	5	10	5	2.76	1404/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	1	4	8	19	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	3	10	9	9	3.32	1345/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	6	2	8	8	12	3.50	759/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	1	5	1	0	1	2.38	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GRIMM,IVY (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 252  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	11	6	11	3	2.89	1619/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	9	9	7	5	2.89	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	9	6	9	3.17	1332/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	6	4	6	2	2.90	1552/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	6	14	11	3.94	872/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1355/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	8	13	6	3.40	1440/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	863/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	4	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1480/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	3	0	3	3	2	3.09	1449/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1513/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	****/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	5	1	2	0	2	2.30	1479/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	3	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	5	5	10	5	2.76	1404/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	1	4	8	19	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	3	10	9	9	3.32	1345/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	6	2	8	8	12	3.50	759/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	1	5	1	0	1	2.38	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 59  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 253  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	11	6	11	3	2.89	1619/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	9	9	7	5	2.89	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	9	6	9	3.17	1332/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	3	6	4	6	2	2.90	1552/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	6	14	11	3.94	872/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	2	2	3	5	2	3.21	1355/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	8	13	6	3.40	1440/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	863/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	5	0	2	5	10	2	3.63	1293/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1330/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	1	2	4	3	7	3.76	1466/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1255/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	3	2	3	2	2.85	1427/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	5	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	****/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	5	5	10	5	2.76	1404/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	5	1	4	8	19	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	6	3	10	9	9	3.32	1345/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	6	2	8	8	12	3.50	759/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	1	5	1	0	1	2.38	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	0						



Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H. MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 254  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	3.38	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8	3.43	1502/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11	3.43	1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1	2.85	1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17	3.76	1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3	3.14	1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15	3.55	1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	3	2	16	16	7	3.50	1357/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	6	12	18	16	3.69	1343/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	3	7	43	4.64	1069/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	7	19	11	12	3.33	1380/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	4	8	4	12	18	8	3.28	1371/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	7	2	12	9	15	3.51	934/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14	3.48	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23	3.91	1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	7	13	14	14	3.43	1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8	16	3.56	741/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H. MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 254  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 14	General 0	Under-grad 56 Non-major 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	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 41		
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 255  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	3.38	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8	3.43	1502/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11	3.43	1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1	2.85	1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17	3.76	1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3	3.14	1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15	3.55	1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	2	5	22	9	4	3.19	1472/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	5	13	11	15	3.70	1343/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	2	2	5	15	24	4.19	1364/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	6	11	19	7	3.51	1327/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	6	8	9	14	9	3.26	1374/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	11	2	3	13	6	7	3.42	989/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14	3.48	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23	3.91	1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	7	13	14	14	3.43	1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8	16	3.56	741/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 255  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 14	General 0	Under-grad 56 Non-major 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	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 41		
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 256  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	3.38	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8	3.43	1502/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11	3.43	1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1	2.85	1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17	3.76	1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3	3.14	1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15	3.55	1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	7	3	0	4	14	5	3.69	1255/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	4	3	11	11	3.81	1307/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	4	4	7	14	3.97	1419/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	3	2	7	10	7	3.55	1315/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	1	2	0	7	13	6	3.75	1243/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	11	2	1	6	2	4	3.33	1027/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14	3.48	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23	3.91	1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	7	13	14	14	3.43	1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8	16	3.56	741/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 256  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 14	General 0	Under-grad 56 Non-major 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	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 41		
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 257  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	22	19	7	3.38	1532/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	4	20	20	8	3.43	1502/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	3	8	16	15	11	3.43	1261/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	3	8	14	7	1	2.85	1562/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	4	12	13	17	3.76	1062/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	2	5	6	6	3	3.14	1382/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	15	13	15	3.55	1377/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	5	1	3	11	8	0	3.13	1488/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	1	5	4	6	6	3.50	1389/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	4	0	7	8	5	3.42	1499/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	33	0	4	1	8	5	5	3.26	1392/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	2	3	4	7	4	5	3.17	1388/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	5	3	0	9	1	5	3.28	1051/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	5	14	15	14	3.48	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	6	10	13	23	3.91	1117/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	7	13	14	14	3.43	1310/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	4	4	18	8	16	3.56	741/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 66  
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 257  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 14	General 0	Under-grad 56 Non-major 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 9	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 41		
			? 1		



Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H. MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 258  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11	3.52	1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0	2.54	1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	6	11	14	11	3.53	1381/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	5	1	0	1	1	41	4.84	825/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	10	7	11	8	2	2.61	1555/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	11	10	10	7	9	2.85	1476/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	5	5	10	26	4.10	1391/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	14	13	5	11	5	2.58	1465/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	7	17	6	4	8	6	2.51	1456/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	10	11	4	6	10	2.88	1167/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16	3.24	1274/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20	3.80	1179/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18	3.57	1253/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	3	3	7	9	19	3.93	581/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H. MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 258  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 259  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11	3.52	1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0	2.54	1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	6	11	14	11	3.53	1381/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	5	1	0	1	1	41	4.84	825/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	6	16	11	3	3.18	1475/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	4	6	8	6	14	3.53	1385/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	2	2	6	8	20	4.11	1391/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	5	5	5	12	12	3.54	1321/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	2	8	5	5	7	12	3.27	1372/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	3	7	7	10	7	3.32	1032/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16	3.24	1274/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20	3.80	1179/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18	3.57	1253/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	3	3	7	9	19	3.93	581/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 259  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 260  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11	3.52	1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0	2.54	1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	6	11	14	11	3.53	1381/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	5	1	0	1	1	41	4.84	825/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	2	2	1	5	9	6	3.70	1255/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	3	1	4	3	11	3.82	1303/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	3	0	5	4	12	3.92	1439/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	3	2	4	7	7	3.57	1312/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	5	0	4	6	8	3.52	1315/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	3	2	1	8	3	4	3.33	1027/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16	3.24	1274/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20	3.80	1179/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18	3.57	1253/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	3	3	7	9	19	3.93	581/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 260  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 49 Non-major 48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 33		
			? 3		

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 261  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	7	15	10	10	3.23	1570/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	8	16	11	8	3.14	1561/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	7	7	11	13	8	3.17	1329/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	6	9	9	7	4	2.83	1565/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	6	5	3	17	11	3.52	1217/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	6	6	5	7	0	2.54	1510/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	6	11	14	11	3.53	1381/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	5	1	0	1	1	41	4.84	825/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	2	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	891/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	1	7	2	12	3.88	1281/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	0	8	4	11	4.00	1404/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	1	2	6	6	9	3.83	1197/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	3	1	5	7	8	3.67	1277/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	4	1	3	4	5	7	3.70	818/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	12	4	7	7	16	3.24	1274/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	6	5	10	20	3.80	1179/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	6	6	8	8	18	3.57	1253/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	3	3	7	9	19	3.93	581/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.93	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 70  
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 261  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	33				
				?	3						



Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H. MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 262  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	6	12	12	6	3.14	1583/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	11	14	2	2.88	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	5	10	7	14	2	2.95	1372/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	2	8	11	2	3.27	1470/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	10	14	5	3.21	1383/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	3	6	7	1	3.00	1410/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	12	8	11	7	3.22	1501/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	731/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	10	7	7	12	1	2.65	1551/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	8	2	10	9	13	3.40	1407/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	4	6	7	23	4.07	1394/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	14	8	6	8	6	2.62	1462/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	19	2	6	8	5	2.45	1464/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	14	1	3	13	7	2.95	1142/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	7	13	10	3.49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.49	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	15	14	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	14	10	10	3.51	1274/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	5	7	10	14	3.69	677/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: PERKS, H. MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 262  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 263  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	6	12	12	6	3.14	1583/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	11	14	2	2.88	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	5	10	7	14	2	2.95	1372/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	2	8	11	2	3.27	1470/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	10	14	5	3.21	1383/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	3	6	7	1	3.00	1410/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	12	8	11	7	3.22	1501/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	731/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	1	3	23	5	3.82	1156/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	3	5	9	15	4.13	1160/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	5	10	17	4.38	1284/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	1	8	9	12	3.97	1106/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	4	4	1	14	7	3.53	1313/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	3	1	9	8	5	3.42	983/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	7	13	10	3.49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.49	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	15	14	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	14	10	10	3.51	1274/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	5	7	10	14	3.69	677/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: OLSON, WENDY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 263  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 264  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	6	12	12	6	3.14	1583/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	11	14	2	2.88	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	5	10	7	14	2	2.95	1372/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	2	8	11	2	3.27	1470/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	10	14	5	3.21	1383/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	3	6	7	1	3.00	1410/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	12	8	11	7	3.22	1501/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	731/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	3	1	0	2	12	8	4.13	820/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	1136/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	5	3	14	4.41	1270/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	2	3	8	10	4.00	1066/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	2	2	2	8	8	3.82	1219/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1045/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	7	13	10	3.49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.49	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	15	14	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	14	10	10	3.51	1274/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	5	7	10	14	3.69	677/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 264  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 265  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	6	12	12	6	3.14	1583/1669	3.16	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	11	14	2	2.88	1594/1666	3.09	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	5	10	7	14	2	2.95	1372/1421	3.18	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	3	2	8	11	2	3.27	1470/1617	2.96	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	10	14	5	3.21	1383/1555	3.61	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	3	3	6	7	1	3.00	1410/1543	2.97	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	12	8	11	7	3.22	1501/1647	3.43	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	3	0	1	0	1	35	4.89	731/1668	4.89	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	0	0	5	8	6	4.05	884/1605	3.40	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	974/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	1193/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1005/1503	3.43	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1184/1506	3.13	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	4	0	3	1	6	3	3.69	825/1311	3.28	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	4	7	13	10	3.49	1166/1490	3.24	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.49	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	6	15	14	3.95	1075/1502	3.90	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	0	14	10	10	3.51	1274/1489	3.46	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	5	7	10	14	3.69	677/1006	3.67	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 52  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 265  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	3						



Course Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 266  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1525/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	4	6	1	3.20	1548/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	1	2	2	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1448/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	905/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1260/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	2	4	3.40	1440/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1325/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	9	3	3.80	1307/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	788/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1277/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	5	2	3.27	1374/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	861/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	196/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.46	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	162/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	181/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.07	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	161/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	176/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.42	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 267  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1525/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	4	6	1	3.20	1548/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	1	2	2	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1448/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	905/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1260/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	6	2	4	3.40	1440/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	918/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1199/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1452/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1255/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1392/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	196/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.46	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	162/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	181/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.07	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	161/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	176/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.42	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 3			

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0201  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 268  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1581/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1466/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1403/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1133/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1410/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1393/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1464/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1398/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1231/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1404/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1376/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	939/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1395/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1376/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1168/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	202/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	123/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	187/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	214/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	138/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.91	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0201  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 269  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1581/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1466/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1403/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1133/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1410/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1393/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	6	0	0	2.50	1561/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1395/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1376/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1168/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	202/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	123/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	187/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	2	2	4	1	3.00	214/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	138/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.91	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0301  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 270  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	7	5	0	2.60	1636/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	5	6	1	2.75	1615/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	5	5	2	3	0	2.20	1417/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	6	3	1	2.58	1586/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	4	5	4	1	2.76	1488/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	2.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	6	3	2	2.88	1468/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	4	5	2	3	2.68	1567/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	5	4	2	3	1	2.40	1568/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	6	4	6	1	2	2.42	1490/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	2.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	3	0	7	7	3.89	1446/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	7	2	5	0	2.44	1475/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	2.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	4	3	4	0	2.22	1484/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	6	2	1	4	4	2.88	1165/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	1	2	3	0	1.93	1476/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	1.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	3	3	4	1	2.67	1463/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	3	4	0	2.50	1468/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	990/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	4	4	4	1	2.75	224/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	2.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	2	7	3	1	2.81	224/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	2.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	214/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	207/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	2	3	6	1	2	2.86	197/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0301  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MENDEX, MIGUEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 271  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	7	5	0	2.60	1636/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	5	6	1	2.75	1615/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	5	5	2	3	0	2.20	1417/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	6	3	1	2.58	1586/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	4	5	4	1	2.76	1488/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	2.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	6	3	2	2.88	1468/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	4	5	2	3	2.68	1567/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	428/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	8	1	3.64	1286/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1457/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	2.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	3	1	4	1	3.33	1509/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1398/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	2.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1396/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	3	2	1	2	3.25	1057/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	1	2	3	0	1.93	1476/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	1.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	3	3	4	1	2.67	1463/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	4	3	3	4	0	2.50	1468/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	4	1	2	3	0	2.40	990/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	4	4	4	1	2.75	224/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	2.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	2	7	3	1	2.81	224/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	2.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	214/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	207/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	2	3	6	1	2	2.86	197/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0401  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 272  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1520/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1387/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1222/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	6	0	3.56	1353/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1062/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	0	6	0	3.20	1358/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	918/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1082/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1193/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1025/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1243/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	967/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1447/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1357/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1434/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	923/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	174/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	139/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	153/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	189/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	158/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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 11		
				? 0			

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0401  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 273  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1520/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1387/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1222/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	6	0	3.56	1353/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1062/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	0	6	0	3.20	1358/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1412/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1199/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1467/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1210/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1243/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	939/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1447/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	2.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1357/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1434/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	923/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	174/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	139/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	153/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	189/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	2	0	4	4	3.73	158/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	11				
				?	0						



Course Section: CHEM 102L 0501  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 274  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	8	2	1	2.53	1645/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	7	5	4	0	2.53	1635/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	5	2	2	1	2	2.42	1412/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	4	2	3	3	3	2.93	1541/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	3	4	5	3.17	1395/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	5	1	3	2	2	2.62	1501/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	3	4	4	1	2.50	1586/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	6	6	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	2.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	5	8	1	3.35	1415/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	1448/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	4	6	1	3.13	1413/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	2.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	4	5	2	2	2.75	1436/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	1	0	6	4	3.33	1027/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	2	3	1	3	2.92	221/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	2.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	4	0	2	5	1	2.92	222/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	2.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	209/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	5	1	2	2	2	2.58	218/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	2.58	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	4	0	5	1	1	2.55	201/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.55	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 16

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

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0501  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 275  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	8	2	1	2.53	1645/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	2.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	7	5	4	0	2.53	1635/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	2.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	5	2	2	1	2	2.42	1412/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	4	2	3	3	3	2.93	1541/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	3	4	5	3.17	1395/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	5	1	3	2	2	2.62	1501/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	2.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	3	4	4	1	2.50	1586/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	8	3	2	1	0	1.71	1598/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	2.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1433/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	4	0	3	3	3	3.08	1522/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	4	1	3	3	2	2.85	1443/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	2.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	3	1	1	2	2.33	1476/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	2.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	2	2	0	1	2	2.86	1173/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	2	3	1	3	2.92	221/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	2.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	4	0	2	5	1	2.92	222/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	2.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	209/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	5	1	2	2	2	2.58	218/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	2.58	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	4	0	5	1	1	2.55	201/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.55	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 5	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 19
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 16

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

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0601  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 276  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	6	6	4	3.50	1480/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	6	3	3.35	1523/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	1	1	8	2	3.50	1222/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	6	5	4	4	3.32	1455/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	8	5	3.79	1037/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	7	2	3.47	1272/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	6	4	4	3.37	1459/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	4	8	2	1	2.67	1549/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	5	5	7	2	3.20	1438/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	1338/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	5	7	2	3.10	1417/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	4	4	4	1	2.40	1470/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	4	6	2	3.25	1057/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	0	1	1	0	1.83	1480/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	1.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	920/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1038/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	190/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	158/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.94	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	137/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.41	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	128/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.41	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	129/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.94	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0601  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 277  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	6	6	4	3.50	1480/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	6	3	3.35	1523/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	1	1	8	2	3.50	1222/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	6	5	4	4	3.32	1455/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	8	5	3.79	1037/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	6	7	2	3.47	1272/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	6	4	4	3.37	1459/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	525/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	955/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1361/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1015/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1262/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	846/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	0	1	1	0	1.83	1480/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	1.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	920/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1038/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	190/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	158/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.94	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	137/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.41	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	128/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.41	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	129/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.94	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0701  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 278  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	4	5	3.40	1525/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	6	2	5	3.05	1574/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	4	4	3	2	2.71	1395/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	6	2	4	2	3	2.65	1582/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	1	5	3	4	3.00	1427/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	2	2	4	3	3.00	1410/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	5	4	4	1	2.61	1580/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	926/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	0	5	3	3	2.94	1518/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	1	5	4	4	3.17	1442/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	5	4	9	4.05	1397/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	1	4	4	3	2.74	1453/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	5	0	6	2.95	1413/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	5	1	4	3	3	2.88	1167/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1265/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1301/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1191/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	902/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	182/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	6	3	2	3.21	216/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	144/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	178/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	3	0	3	6	1	3.15	185/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.15	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0701  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 278  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0701  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 279  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	4	5	3.40	1525/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	6	2	5	3.05	1574/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	4	4	3	2	2.71	1395/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	6	2	4	2	3	2.65	1582/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	1	5	3	4	3.00	1427/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	2	2	4	3	3.00	1410/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	5	4	4	1	2.61	1580/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	926/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	737/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1337/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1381/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1245/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	5	2	6	3.67	1277/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1210/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1265/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1301/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1191/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	902/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	182/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	6	3	2	3.21	216/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	144/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	3	1	4	6	3.93	178/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	3	0	3	6	1	3.15	185/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.15	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0701  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 279  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						



Course Section: CHEM 102L 0801  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 280  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1395/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1455/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	1	3	1	2.78	1388/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1552/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	715/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1349/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	1	2	2.77	1559/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	1475/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	0	6	4	3.69	1343/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	1374/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	1	4	5	3.62	1297/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	2	5	2	3.08	1399/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	757/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1251/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	950/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1398/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	184/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	198/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	152/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	204/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	197/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 2		

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0801  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 281  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1395/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1455/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	1	3	1	2.78	1388/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1552/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	2.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	715/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	1349/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	1	2	2.77	1559/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	2.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	2	1	6	3.58	1373/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	1	0	4	4	3.42	1499/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	3.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	0	4	4	3.64	1289/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	2	4	3.36	1355/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	791/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1251/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	950/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1398/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	184/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	198/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	152/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	204/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	197/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	2.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 2		

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 282  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	3	4	3.24	1568/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	2	5	3.35	1523/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	5	1	1	2.50	1407/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1393/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	4	4	3	3.40	1303/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	4	1	3.13	1382/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	6	3	4	3.50	1393/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1446/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	2	7	3.53	1385/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	1384/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	5	4	3.53	1321/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	4	1	5	3.27	1374/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	3.00	1115/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	1178/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1154/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	1352/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	169/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	139/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.10	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	206/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	3	0	5	3.80	185/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	177/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	44/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	3.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	34/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	46/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	3.40	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	34/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	3.20	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 282  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KATX, CIVIA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 283  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	3	4	3.24	1568/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	2	5	3.35	1523/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	4	5	1	1	2.50	1407/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	2.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1393/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	4	4	3	3.40	1303/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	4	1	3.13	1382/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	6	3	4	3.50	1393/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	871/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	1082/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	1304/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	959/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	1033/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	1	2	0	5	3.78	780/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	6	4	2	3.46	1178/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1154/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	1352/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	967/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	169/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	139/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.10	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	206/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	3.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	2	3	0	5	3.80	185/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	3.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	177/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	44/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	3.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	34/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	46/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	3.40	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	34/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	3.20	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102L 0901  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KATX, CIVIA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 283  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 102L 1001  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 284  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1570/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1387/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1251/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1062/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1496/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	901/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1357/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	3.60	1369/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	1361/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1386/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	1	3	3.00	1403/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	890/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1154/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1155/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	759/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	212/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	127/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	170/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	109/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	110/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102L 1001  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 284  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: CHEM 102L 1001  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 285  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1570/1669	3.22	3.81	4.23	4.02	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1387/1666	3.26	3.72	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1339/1421	2.90	3.49	4.24	4.11	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1251/1617	3.19	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1062/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.19	3.48	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1496/1647	3.10	3.70	4.12	4.06	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	901/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	918/1605	3.33	3.76	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	892/1514	3.64	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	986/1551	4.06	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1005/1503	3.48	3.91	4.24	4.17	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1236/1506	3.20	3.80	4.26	4.17	3.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	904/1311	3.35	3.57	3.85	3.68	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1154/1490	2.81	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1253/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1155/1489	3.37	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	759/1006	2.91	3.68	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	212/ 226	3.38	4.02	4.20	3.98	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	127/ 233	3.70	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	170/ 225	4.08	4.35	4.50	4.42	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	109/ 223	3.68	4.14	4.35	4.19	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	110/ 206	3.40	3.87	4.15	4.01	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.80	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	3.40	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	3.20	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: CHEM 102L 1001  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 285  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 123 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA  
 Enrollment: 99  
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 286  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	10	22	32	4.29	864/1669	4.29	3.81	4.23	4.02	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	4	32	24	4.15	993/1666	4.15	3.72	4.19	4.11	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	13	36	4.15	894/1421	4.15	3.49	4.24	4.11	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	2	3	5	15	13	3.89	1173/1617	3.89	3.45	4.15	3.99	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	4	14	10	19	3.88	963/1555	3.88	3.79	4.00	3.92	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	37	0	1	6	9	10	4.08	850/1543	4.08	3.48	4.06	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	7	13	41	4.41	651/1647	4.41	3.70	4.12	4.06	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	63	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	2	5	26	17	4.10	857/1605	4.10	3.76	4.07	3.96	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	10	49	4.73	489/1514	4.73	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	56	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.36	4.66	4.55	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	4	5	21	29	4.22	914/1503	4.22	3.91	4.24	4.17	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	12	42	4.44	731/1506	4.44	3.80	4.26	4.17	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	6	24	28	4.32	397/1311	4.32	3.57	3.85	3.68	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	5	1	3	7	7	3.43	1196/1490	3.43	3.53	4.05	3.85	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	3	7	6	6	3.57	1287/1502	3.57	3.84	4.26	4.06	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	4	3	3	6	7	3.39	1321/1489	3.39	3.59	4.29	4.07	3.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	4	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	424/1006	4.17	3.68	4.00	3.81	4.17	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.09	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	18	General	0	Under-grad	65	Non-major	65
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	50				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIELE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 287  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	13	4	3.86	1313/1669	3.86	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	1164/1666	3.95	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1061/1421	3.91	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1279/1617	3.70	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	933/1647	4.18	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	1293/1605	3.70	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	17	4.68	553/1514	4.68	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	1069/1551	4.64	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	2	8	8	3.86	1184/1503	3.86	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	5	10	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	3	2	6	7	3.94	654/1311	3.94	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1412/1490	2.71	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	135/ 233	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	112/ 225	4.63	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	124/ 223	4.44	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	95/ 206	4.38	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 2			
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 18		
				? 1			

Course Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: CHORNOGUZ, OLES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 288  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	13	4	3.86	1313/1669	3.86	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	1164/1666	3.95	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1061/1421	3.91	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1279/1617	3.70	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	933/1647	4.18	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1187/1605	3.70	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1514	4.68	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1551	4.64	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/1503	3.86	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	3.94	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1412/1490	2.71	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	135/ 233	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	112/ 225	4.63	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	124/ 223	4.44	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	95/ 206	4.38	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
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	18				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 289  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	13	4	3.86	1313/1669	3.86	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	1164/1666	3.95	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1061/1421	3.91	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1279/1617	3.70	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	933/1647	4.18	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1164/1605	3.70	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1514	4.68	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1551	4.64	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1503	3.86	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1412/1490	2.71	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	135/ 233	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	112/ 225	4.63	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	124/ 223	4.44	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	95/ 206	4.38	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: YANG, DONG (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 290  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	13	4	3.86	1313/1669	3.86	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	1164/1666	3.95	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1061/1421	3.91	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1279/1617	3.70	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	622/1555	4.19	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1543	4.14	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	933/1647	4.18	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1334/1605	3.70	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1514	4.68	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1551	4.64	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1503	3.86	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1412/1490	2.71	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1395/1502	3.00	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.50	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	108/ 226	4.38	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	135/ 233	4.13	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	112/ 225	4.63	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	124/ 223	4.44	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	95/ 206	4.38	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 2		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 301 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY  
 Enrollment: 90  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 291  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	16	25	4.47	647/1669	4.47	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	19	22	4.38	727/1666	4.38	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	11	31	4.66	405/1421	4.66	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	0	6	5	10	4.19	863/1617	4.19	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	6	8	13	12	3.53	1212/1555	3.53	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	380/1543	4.52	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	11	28	4.52	458/1647	4.52	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	20	13	4.21	737/1605	4.21	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	6	36	4.79	376/1514	4.79	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	38	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	15	22	4.33	811/1503	4.33	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	11	30	4.60	547/1506	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	27	1	2	4	1	6	3.64	861/1311	3.64	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	0	2	0	0	5	4.14	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	39	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	



Course Section: CHEM 301 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY  
 Enrollment: 90  
 Questionnaires: 46

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 291  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major	39
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 292  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1014/1669	4.28	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	11	1	3.71	1358/1666	3.92	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1292/1421	3.71	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1126/1617	4.22	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	698/1555	4.22	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	735/1543	4.39	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1300/1647	3.97	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	10	4	4.13	820/1605	3.79	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	923/1514	4.07	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.57	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	742/1503	4.35	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	995/1506	4.10	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1213/1311	3.13	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	849/1490	4.27	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1253/1502	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1258/1489	3.97	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	89/ 226	4.59	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	123/ 233	4.40	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	179/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	152/ 223	4.47	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	117/ 206	4.40	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	3
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Other	18
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: SUN, JIAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 293  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1014/1669	4.28	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	11	1	3.71	1358/1666	3.92	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1292/1421	3.71	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1126/1617	4.22	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	698/1555	4.22	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	735/1543	4.39	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1300/1647	3.97	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	5	5	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.79	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1352/1514	4.07	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1377/1551	4.57	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1503	4.35	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1506	4.10	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	849/1490	4.27	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1253/1502	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1258/1489	3.97	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	89/ 226	4.59	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	123/ 233	4.40	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	179/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	152/ 223	4.47	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	117/ 206	4.40	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	18				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: BALU, RAD (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 294  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	14	3	4.18	1014/1669	4.28	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	11	1	3.71	1358/1666	3.92	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1292/1421	3.71	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	1126/1617	4.22	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	698/1555	4.22	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	735/1543	4.39	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	5	6	3.71	1300/1647	3.97	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1299/1605	3.79	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1514	4.07	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1551	4.57	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1503	4.35	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1506	4.10	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	849/1490	4.27	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1253/1502	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1258/1489	3.97	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	89/ 226	4.59	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	123/ 233	4.40	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	179/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	152/ 223	4.47	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	0	4	5	4.00	117/ 206	4.40	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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	18				
				?	3						

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 295  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	690/1669	4.28	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	881/1666	3.92	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	797/1421	3.71	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	347/1617	4.22	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	461/1555	4.22	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	226/1543	4.39	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	697/1647	3.97	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1092/1605	3.79	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1160/1514	4.07	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1000/1551	4.57	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	823/1503	4.35	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1042/1506	4.10	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	846/1311	3.13	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	340/1490	4.27	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	3.97	3.59	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	43/ 226	4.59	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	55/ 233	4.40	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	110/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	42/ 223	4.47	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.40	3.87	4.15	4.08	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 295  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: BALU, RAD (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 296  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	690/1669	4.28	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	881/1666	3.92	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	797/1421	3.71	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	347/1617	4.22	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	461/1555	4.22	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	226/1543	4.39	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	697/1647	3.97	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/1605	3.79	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1514	4.07	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1551	4.57	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1503	4.35	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1506	4.10	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	3.13	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	340/1490	4.27	3.53	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	4.04	3.84	4.26	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	3.97	3.59	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	43/ 226	4.59	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	55/ 233	4.40	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	110/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	42/ 223	4.47	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 206	4.40	3.87	4.15	4.08	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 311L 0201  
 Title ADVANCED LAB I  
 Instructor: BALU, RAD (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 296  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						



Course Section: CHEM 351 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA  
 Enrollment: 195  
 Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 297  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	13	24	62	4.47	647/1669	4.49	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	16	31	52	4.36	740/1666	4.37	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	5	12	29	49	4.15	894/1421	4.24	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	40	3	2	14	13	26	3.98	1056/1617	4.09	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	2	3	13	26	44	4.22	592/1555	4.28	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	62	0	2	9	13	13	4.00	895/1543	4.08	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	1	2	15	25	54	4.33	775/1647	4.43	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	2	95	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	2	10	47	27	4.15	800/1605	4.32	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	8	18	70	4.61	679/1514	4.64	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	7	89	4.89	567/1551	4.91	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	14	31	49	4.32	811/1503	4.37	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	9	21	62	4.42	744/1506	4.41	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	27	8	5	22	14	19	3.46	967/1311	3.51	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	2	1	10	7	7	3.59	1120/1490	3.59	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	0	2	4	3	15	4.29	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	0	3	5	6	11	4.00	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	78	17	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	100	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	100	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	100	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	100	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	100	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	101	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	100	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	101	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	101	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	101	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351 0101  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA  
Enrollment: 195  
Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2006

Page 297  
JAN 18, 2007  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 23	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 2	Major 7
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 1	B 24			
56-83	15	2.00-2.99 6	C 32	General 1	Under-grad 100	Non-major 95
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 20	D 1			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 21	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other 80		
			? 6			

Course Section: CHEM 351 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 195  
 Questionnaires: 101

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 298  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	15	19	67	4.51	578/1669	4.49	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	32	55	4.39	715/1666	4.37	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	14	22	59	4.33	746/1421	4.24	3.49	4.24	4.25	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	44	0	3	9	19	26	4.19	863/1617	4.09	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	2	11	31	51	4.34	484/1555	4.28	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	74	1	1	4	7	13	4.15	771/1543	4.08	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	9	23	66	4.53	446/1647	4.43	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	96	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	0	5	31	51	4.49	398/1605	4.32	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	22	74	4.67	569/1514	4.64	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	94	4.93	358/1551	4.91	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	9	34	55	4.41	702/1503	4.37	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	9	23	62	4.39	779/1506	4.41	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	44	4	3	17	18	12	3.57	904/1311	3.51	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	92	0	4	0	0	1	4	3.11	****/1490	3.59	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	91	0	1	0	4	0	5	3.80	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	90	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	89	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	95	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	96	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	96	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	96	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	96	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	100	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	99	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	100	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 3
28-55	33	1.00-1.99 1	B 50		
56-83	19	2.00-2.99 14	C 20	General 1	Under-grad 100 Non-major 98
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 16	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 46	F 1	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 94	
			? 5		

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 299  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	889/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1094/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1302/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1155/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	735/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	436/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	861/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	965/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1463/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	117/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	80/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	85/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	69/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 299  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 300  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	889/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1094/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1302/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1155/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	735/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	857/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1100/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1028/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1005/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1236/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1463/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	117/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	80/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	85/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	69/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 300  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 301  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1320/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1273/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1332/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1345/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	1	3.36	1319/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1130/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1295/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	800/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	923/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1055/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	914/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	1069/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	445/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1208/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	134/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	104/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	136/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	117/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		



Course Section: CHEM 351L 0201  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZHAO, CHUMANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 302  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1320/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1273/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1332/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	3	4	3.57	1345/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	7	1	3.36	1319/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1130/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	3	6	3.71	1295/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1443/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1250/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1254/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1208/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	134/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.14	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	104/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	136/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	117/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0301  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 303  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1048/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1072/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1168/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	644/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1006/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1223/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	769/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	441/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	460/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	800/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	757/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	139/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.10	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	127/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	98/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	107/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.20	

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	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0301  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 304  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1048/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1072/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1168/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	644/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1006/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	1223/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	840/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	799/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1284/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1319/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	139/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.10	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	127/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	98/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	107/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.20	

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	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 305  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1345/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1235/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	1	1	3.00	1357/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1459/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	1138/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1416/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	719/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	958/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1027/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1417/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	161/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	181/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	163/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 305  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 306  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1345/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1235/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	1	1	3.00	1357/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1459/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	1138/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1416/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1325/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	984/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1384/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	996/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1199/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1027/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1417/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1454/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	161/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	181/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	163/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 306  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 307  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	816/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1325/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	1346/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	0	9	4	3.69	1290/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	955/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	1060/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1225/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	892/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	1152/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1127/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1262/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1167/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	128/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.24	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	158/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.94	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	167/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.19	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	93/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	115/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.06	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	



Course Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 307  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	16				
			? 0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZINK, NICK (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 308  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	816/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1325/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	1346/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	0	0	9	4	3.69	1290/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	7	6	3.89	955/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	1060/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	871/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	908/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1381/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	800/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1194/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1072/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	128/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.24	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	158/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.94	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	167/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.19	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	93/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	115/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.06	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0501  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZINK, NICK (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 308  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0601  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 309  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1329/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	3	3	0	2.88	1383/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1360/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1309/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1303/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	2	2	3.31	1489/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1293/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1168/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	9	1	3.85	1193/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	1296/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1072/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1450/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1441/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	200/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	96/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	152/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	144/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0601  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 310  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1329/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	3	3	0	2.88	1383/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	2.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1360/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1309/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1303/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	2	2	3.31	1489/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1326/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1066/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1069/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1195/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1450/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1441/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	200/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	96/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	152/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	164/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	144/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0701  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 311  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1265/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1402/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	1286/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1414/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	773/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1232/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1411/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	7	2	3.82	1164/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	650/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	914/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	1038/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1084/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1301/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1191/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	108/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	183/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	142/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	196/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	178/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0701  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TANTREVEDI, SAR (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 312  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	1265/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1402/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	1	4	2	3.36	1286/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1414/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	773/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1232/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1411/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	4	3	2	1	2.82	1538/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1389/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1477/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1413/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1341/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1301/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1191/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	108/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	183/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	142/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	196/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	178/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0801  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 313  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	463/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	881/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1135/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1356/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	541/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	838/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	882/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1195/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	441/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	705/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	556/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	965/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	116/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1450/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1361/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	56/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	91/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	167/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.18	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	73/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	95/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	

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	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	11				
				?	0						



Course Section: CHEM 351L 0801  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 314  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	463/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	881/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1135/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1356/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	541/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	838/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	882/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	335/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	308/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	880/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	210/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	273/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	116/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1450/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1361/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	56/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	91/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	167/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.18	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	73/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	95/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	14
			Other	11	Major
					0
					Non-major
					14
					**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0901  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 315  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1498/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1455/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1208/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1503/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	3	4	3.58	1187/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1019/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1522/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	3	1	3.36	1416/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	877/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	986/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1219/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1260/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1202/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1469/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	162/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	203/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	112/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	158/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.13	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	103/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: CHEM 351L 0901  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 316  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1498/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1455/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1208/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1503/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	1	3	4	3.58	1187/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1019/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1522/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1416/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1277/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1404/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1235/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1392/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1202/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1469/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	2.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	162/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	203/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	112/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	158/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.13	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	103/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1001  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 317  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	7	3	3.60	1437/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	4	5	3.67	1387/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	0	4	4	3.46	1244/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1341/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	676/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1115/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	2	2	6	3.64	1331/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	1017/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	3	4	1	3.20	1470/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	1313/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	0	5	7	4.07	1394/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	0	5	3	3	3.21	1399/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	1277/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1213/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	160/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	176/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	123/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	182/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	4	1	3	3	3.45	173/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.45	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1001  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 317  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
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	9				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1001  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZHAO, CHAMANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 318  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	7	3	3.60	1437/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	4	5	3.67	1387/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	0	4	4	3.46	1244/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1341/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	676/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1115/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	2	2	6	3.64	1331/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	1017/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	1022/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1239/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1176/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1277/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	160/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	176/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	123/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	182/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	4	1	3	3	3.45	173/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.45	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1001  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZHAO, CHAMANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 318  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
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	9				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1101  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 319  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	854/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	5	1	1	3	3.20	1319/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1334/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1160/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	997/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	591/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	512/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	519/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1069/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	846/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	0	0	2.50	1431/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1279/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1318/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	105/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
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 6		
				? 0			



Course Section: CHEM 351L 1101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 320  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1173/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	854/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	5	1	1	3	3.20	1319/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1334/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1087/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1160/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	997/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	713/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	751/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1231/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	519/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	892/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	846/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	0	0	2.50	1431/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1279/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1318/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	70/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	105/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.22	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
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 6		
				? 0			

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1201  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 321  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1511/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	6	2	3.50	1466/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	1	6	2	3.21	1316/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1251/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	5	5	3.50	1227/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1226/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1425/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	918/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	1064/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1055/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.04	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1030/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1038/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1084/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	160/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	167/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	187/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	199/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	165/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.64	

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	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1201  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 322  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1511/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	6	2	3.50	1466/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	1	6	2	3.21	1316/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1251/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	5	5	3.50	1227/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	1226/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1425/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1092/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1498/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.04	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1258/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	160/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	167/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	187/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	199/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	165/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.64	

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	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1301  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 323  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1205/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	922/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	492/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	690/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	386/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	471/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	66/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	68/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	212/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	110/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1301  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 324  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	478/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1205/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	922/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	492/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	1	0	3.13	1490/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1307/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1404/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1210/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1069/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	66/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	68/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	212/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	110/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 325  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1326/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	1	4	3.31	1534/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	2	3	2	3.27	1304/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1503/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	773/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1246/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1249/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	861/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1279/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1066/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1330/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1279/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	197/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	146/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	75/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	144/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	3	3	2	3	3.45	173/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.45	

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	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1401  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TEMBRUNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 326  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1326/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	1	4	3.31	1534/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	2	3	2	3.27	1304/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1503/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	773/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1246/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1378/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1064/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1448/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1277/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	1389/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1154/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1279/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	197/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	146/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	75/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	144/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	3	3	2	3	3.45	173/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.45	

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	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1501  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 327  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	5	1	3.38	1530/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	1	1	2.77	1614/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	2.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	4	1	1	2.67	1397/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	1	1	2.85	1562/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	5	2	0	2.67	1505/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	2.77	1486/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	2.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	3	2	0	2.31	1601/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	2.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	3.69	1255/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	799/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1028/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1157/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	1262/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1057/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.18	207/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	8	2	1	3.36	211/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	179/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	210/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	187/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.09	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: CHEM 351L 1501  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: TANTREVEDI, SAR (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 328  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	5	1	3.38	1530/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	1	1	2.77	1614/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	2.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	4	1	1	2.67	1397/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	1	1	2.85	1562/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	5	2	0	2.67	1505/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	2.77	1486/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	2.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	3	2	0	2.31	1601/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	2.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	844/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	4	4	0	3.20	1470/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1199/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1525/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1407/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1443/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	4	5	0	3.18	207/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	3.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	8	2	1	3.36	211/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	3.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	179/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	210/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	3.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	187/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	3.09	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1601  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 329  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	901/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1059/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1100/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1154/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	971/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	857/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	728/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	654/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	715/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	825/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	852/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	884/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1057/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1117/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1179/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1038/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	138/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.07	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	124/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	49/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	82/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.47	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1601  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 329  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1601  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 330  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	901/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1059/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1100/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1154/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	971/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	857/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	728/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	810/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	955/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1160/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1020/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	965/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1117/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1179/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1038/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	138/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.07	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	124/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	49/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	82/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.47	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1601  
Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)  
Enrollment: 17  
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Fall 2006

Page 330  
JAN 18, 2007  
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1701  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 331  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1001/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1094/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	1250/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1323/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1207/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1175/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1164/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	489/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	936/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	637/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	809/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1233/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1160/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	116/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	66/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	122/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	56/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course Section: CHEM 351L 1701  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZINK, NICK (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 332  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1001/1669	3.98	3.81	4.23	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1094/1666	3.82	3.72	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	1250/1421	3.33	3.49	4.24	4.25	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1323/1617	3.58	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1207/1555	3.75	3.79	4.00	4.03	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1175/1543	3.77	3.48	4.06	4.14	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1043/1647	3.68	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.91	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	373/1605	3.87	3.76	4.07	4.09	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	308/1514	4.38	4.13	4.39	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1551	4.41	4.36	4.66	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1503	4.09	3.91	4.24	4.28	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	642/1506	3.90	3.80	4.26	4.30	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1311	3.36	3.57	3.85	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1233/1490	3.25	3.53	4.05	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1160/1502	3.20	3.84	4.26	4.28	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1279/1489	3.25	3.59	4.29	4.35	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.75	3.68	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	116/ 226	4.11	4.02	4.20	4.17	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	66/ 233	4.11	4.08	4.19	4.13	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	122/ 225	4.49	4.35	4.50	4.45	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 223	4.18	4.14	4.35	4.27	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	56/ 206	3.97	3.87	4.15	4.08	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course Section: CHEM 405 0101  
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 333  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	876/1669	4.29	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	8	6	3.86	1273/1666	3.86	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	1131/1421	3.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	7	4	4	3.63	1323/1617	3.63	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	5	4	2	4	2.67	1505/1555	2.67	3.79	4.00	4.08	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	994/1543	3.93	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	13	4.35	728/1647	4.35	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	901/1668	4.81	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	1039/1605	3.93	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	6	4	9	4.05	1040/1503	4.05	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.33	838/1506	4.33	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	3	5	1	3	3.15	1088/1311	3.15	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	979/1490	3.86	3.53	4.05	4.26	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	859/1502	4.29	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.39	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						



Course Section: CHEM 420 0101  
 Title COMUPTEP APPL IN CHEM  
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 334  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	757/1669	4.38	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	3	2	3.08	1572/1666	3.08	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	3.49	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	1492/1617	3.17	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1303/1555	3.40	3.79	4.00	4.08	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	5	3	1	2.92	1545/1647	2.92	3.70	4.12	4.14	2.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	952/1668	4.77	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	2	4	0	2.80	1540/1605	2.80	3.76	4.07	4.16	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	1343/1514	3.69	4.13	4.39	4.45	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1435/1551	3.92	4.36	4.66	4.73	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	2	3	3	3.15	1409/1503	3.15	3.91	4.24	4.27	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	3	2	2.85	1427/1506	2.85	3.80	4.26	4.29	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CHEM 420 0101  
 Title COMUPTE APPL IN CHEM  
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 334  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	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	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 433 0101  
 Title BIOCHEM OF NUCLEIC ACI  
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 335  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1467/1669	3.54	3.81	4.23	4.39	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1455/1666	3.54	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1095/1421	3.85	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1448/1617	3.33	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1202/1555	3.56	3.79	4.00	4.08	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	1	2	2	2.91	1548/1647	2.91	3.70	4.12	4.14	2.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	844/1668	4.83	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	4	0	3.20	1470/1605	3.20	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1383/1514	3.54	4.13	4.39	4.45	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1321/1503	3.54	3.91	4.24	4.27	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1239/1506	3.77	3.80	4.26	4.29	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	687/1311	3.92	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1391/1490	2.83	3.53	4.05	4.26	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1253/1502	3.67	3.84	4.26	4.46	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	3.59	4.29	4.52	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	

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	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	11	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course Section: CHEM 437 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: GARVIE, COLIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 165  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 336  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	2	6	20	22	4.24	938/1669	4.24	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	9	15	21	3.98	1122/1666	3.98	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	2	2	9	17	17	3.96	1015/1421	3.96	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	31	1	3	1	7	6	3.78	1240/1617	3.78	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	4	8	13	19	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	32	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	8	14	25	4.36	713/1647	4.36	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	3	8	19	14	3.93	1039/1605	3.90	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	7	40	4.78	408/1514	4.63	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	10	37	4.71	954/1551	4.73	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	6	16	24	4.22	905/1503	4.15	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	5	13	28	4.40	779/1506	4.26	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	4	12	28	4.47	291/1311	4.33	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	2	4	8	2	3.33	1233/1490	3.33	3.53	4.05	4.26	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	3	1	1	9	4	3.56	1290/1502	3.56	3.84	4.26	4.46	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1204/1489	3.72	3.59	4.29	4.52	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	11	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Graduate 8
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General	2
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 11	D 2		Under-grad 45
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	37
			? 5		

Course Section: CHEM 437 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 165  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 337  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	2	6	20	22	4.24	938/1669	4.24	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	9	15	21	3.98	1122/1666	3.98	3.72	4.19	4.22	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	2	2	9	17	17	3.96	1015/1421	3.96	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	31	1	3	1	7	6	3.78	1240/1617	3.78	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	4	8	13	19	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	32	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	8	14	25	4.36	713/1647	4.36	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	9	27	5	3.86	1132/1605	3.90	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	5	13	27	4.49	830/1514	4.63	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	7	36	4.76	880/1551	4.73	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	4	5	20	16	4.07	1035/1503	4.15	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	5	16	20	4.13	1002/1506	4.26	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	1	4	4	10	23	4.19	483/1311	4.33	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	2	4	8	2	3.33	1233/1490	3.33	3.53	4.05	4.26	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	3	1	1	9	4	3.56	1290/1502	3.56	3.84	4.26	4.46	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1204/1489	3.72	3.59	4.29	4.52	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	11	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Graduate 8
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General	2
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 11	D 2		Under-grad 45
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	37
			? 5		

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 338  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	244/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	318/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	382/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	655/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	282/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	107/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	223/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	307/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	76/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	188/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	158/1311	4.61	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	340/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	49/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.76	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	144/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.35	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	25/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	81/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	4.47	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 338  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	18				
				?	4						

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: BRIGGS, LATESEH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 339  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	244/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	318/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	382/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	655/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	282/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1225/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1270/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1311	4.61	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	340/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	49/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.76	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	144/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.35	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	25/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	81/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	4.47	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	



Course Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: BRIGGS, LATESEH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 339  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	18				
				?	4						

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title: BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: OLLAND, RYAN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 340  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	244/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	318/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	382/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	655/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	282/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	3	10	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	882/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	591/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1311	4.61	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	340/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	49/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.76	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	144/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.35	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	25/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	1	13	4.47	81/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	4.47	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: OLLAND, RYAN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 340  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	18				
				?	4						

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 341  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	448/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	946/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	773/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	440/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	139/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	113/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	201/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	188/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	264/1311	4.61	3.57	3.85	3.88	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	35/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	155/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	29/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	150/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 341  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	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	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HOLEWINKSI, ROZ (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 342  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	448/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	946/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	773/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	440/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	6	8	0	3.57	1325/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1501/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	35/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	155/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	29/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	150/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HOLEWINKSI, ROZ (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 342  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	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	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HU, GRUOZHANG (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 343  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	448/1669	4.70	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.80	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1421	4.76	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	946/1617	4.37	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	773/1555	4.08	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	440/1543	4.55	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	933/1647	4.19	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	788/1668	4.84	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	2	9	2	0	3.00	1501/1605	4.05	3.76	4.07	4.16	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1514	4.92	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1551	4.44	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1503	4.88	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1506	4.89	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	214/1490	4.73	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	4.68	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	800/1489	4.70	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1006	5.00	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	35/ 226	4.86	4.02	4.20	4.61	4.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 233	4.85	4.08	4.19	4.40	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	155/ 225	4.31	4.35	4.50	4.39	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	29/ 223	4.94	4.14	4.35	4.56	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	150/ 206	4.14	3.87	4.15	4.20	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.20	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	



Course Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: HU, GRUOZHANG (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 343  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	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	16				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 451 0101  
 Title MECH OF ORGANIC REACTI  
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 344  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	15	4.50	590/1669	4.50	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	17	4.54	505/1666	4.54	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	441/1421	4.63	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	156/1617	4.82	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	550/1555	4.27	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	362/1543	4.53	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	2	1	16	4.43	617/1647	4.43	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	448/1605	4.45	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	325/1514	4.83	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	460/1551	4.91	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	451/1503	4.62	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	446/1506	4.68	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1311	****	3.57	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	818/1502	4.33	3.84	4.26	4.46	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	613/1489	4.58	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 9
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		Under-grad 15
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 2		

Course Section: CHEM 451H 0101  
 Title MECHANISMS OF ORGANIC  
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 345  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	3	5.00	1/1669	5.00	3.81	4.23	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	3.72	4.19	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.49	4.24	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.33	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1427/1555	3.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	580/1543	4.33	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.50
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.13	4.39	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.36	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	3.91	4.24	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	3.80	4.26	4.29	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	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	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course Section: CHEM 457 0101  
 Title TOTAL SYN NAT PRODUCTS  
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 346  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	769/1669	4.38	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	922/1666	4.22	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1089/1421	3.86	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1395/1555	3.17	3.79	4.00	4.08	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1076/1543	3.83	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1187/1647	3.88	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	4.75	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	473/1605	4.43	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1082/1514	4.25	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1083/1551	4.63	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	879/1503	4.25	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1010/1506	4.13	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	875/1311	3.63	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course Section: CHEM 457H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 347  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	590/1669	4.50	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	3.49	4.24	4.38	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.50	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.48	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.70	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.50	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.13	4.39	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.36	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.57	3.85	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	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	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	1				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 470 0101  
 Title TOXICOLOGICAL CHEMISTR  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 348  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	556/1669	4.53	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	777/1666	4.33	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	106/1421	4.93	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	641/1617	4.40	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	8	6	4.20	611/1555	4.20	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	516/1543	4.40	3.48	4.06	4.18	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1196/1647	3.87	3.70	4.12	4.14	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.93	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	551/1605	4.36	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.79	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.36	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	777/1503	4.36	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	313/1506	4.79	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	791/1311	3.75	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1490	****	3.53	4.05	4.26	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1502	****	3.84	4.26	4.46	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1489	****	3.59	4.29	4.52	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.68	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.02	4.20	4.61	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.08	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.35	4.50	4.39	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.14	4.35	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	3.87	4.15	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.80	4.22	3.94	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.80	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	3.81	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	3.40	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: CHEM 470 0101  
 Title TOXICOLOGICAL CHEMISTR  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 348  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course Section: CHEM 490A 0101  
 Title OPTICAL SPECTROSCOPY  
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 349  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	4.80	3.81	4.23	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	691/1666	4.40	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	683/1421	4.40	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1425/1617	3.40	3.45	4.15	4.22	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	3.48	4.06	4.18	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	4.40	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.76	4.07	4.16	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	679/1514	4.60	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	932/1503	4.20	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	547/1506	4.60	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	995/1311	3.40	3.57	3.85	3.88	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.53	4.05	4.26	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.84	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	3.59	4.29	4.52	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: CHEM 490B 0101  
 Title QUANTUM CHEM/SPECTROSC  
 Instructor: GREGURICK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 350  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	3.81	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.75	3.72	4.19	4.22	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	557/1421	4.50	3.49	4.24	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1617	4.33	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1555	4.33	3.79	4.00	4.08	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.48	4.06	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	3.70	4.12	4.14	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.91	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	5.00	3.76	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.13	4.39	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.36	4.66	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1503	4.50	3.91	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.50	3.80	4.26	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.57	3.85	3.88	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.53	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.84	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.59	4.29	4.52	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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