

Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101  
 Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD  
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 203  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	2	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.33	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1371/1481	3.33	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1081/1249	3.67	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	1361/1424	3.00	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	4	1	3	2	3.30	1181/1396	3.30	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	276/1459	4.67	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	7	0	1	2.91	1386/1450	2.91	3.65	4.09	3.97	2.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1281/1409	3.60	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1145/1399	3.80	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	1170/1400	3.70	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	549/1179	4.11	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1177/1262	2.90	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	4	1	2	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1025/1256	3.80	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 5	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 1
					Other 3

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 204  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	8	3	3.69	1291/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1096/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1411/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	791/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	6	3	3.31	1324/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1170/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	924/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	941/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1067/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	0	2	8	3.67	1183/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	384/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	1125/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	878/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	996/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	733/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	2.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 205  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	8	3	3.69	1291/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1096/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1411/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	791/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	6	3	3.31	1324/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	5	4	1	3.08	1346/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1211/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1257/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	3	3	3	3.38	1265/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	0	2	4	2.92	1330/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	919/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	1125/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	878/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	996/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	733/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	2.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ZUKOWKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 206  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	8	3	3.69	1291/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1096/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1411/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	791/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	6	3	3.31	1324/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	7	5	0	3.23	1312/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	1211/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1221/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1317/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	2	2	2	2.75	1348/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	972/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	1125/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	878/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	996/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	733/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	2.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KU, THERESE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 207  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	8	3	3.69	1291/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	3	3.63	1275/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1096/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1411/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	791/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	6	3	3.31	1324/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	6	3	0	2.85	1393/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1283/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1344/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	5	2	1	2	2.67	1371/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	4	1	1	2	2.42	1374/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	1125/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	878/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	996/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	733/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	2.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 208  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1248/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	4	3	3.46	1337/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1167/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1275/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	8	1	3.62	1018/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	792/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	1001/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	823/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	783/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1193/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	681/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	2	3	3.08	1137/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1007/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	785/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	588/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 208  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 209  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1248/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	4	3	3.46	1337/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1167/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1275/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	8	1	3.62	1018/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	792/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	968/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	823/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	956/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1104/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1021/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	2	3	3.08	1137/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1007/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	785/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	588/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 209  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ZUKOWKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 210  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1248/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	4	3	3.46	1337/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1167/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1275/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	8	1	3.62	1018/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	792/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1031/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	828/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1017/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	894/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	3	2	3	3.08	1137/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1007/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	785/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	588/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ZUKOWKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 210  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 211  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1303/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	1404/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1054/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1014/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	618/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	823/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	828/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1287/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	705/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1070/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1027/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	860/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	3	0	0	4	3	3.40	650/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 212  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1303/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	1404/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1054/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1398/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1070/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1027/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	860/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	3	0	0	4	3	3.40	650/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		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	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ZUKOWKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 213  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1303/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	1404/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1054/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1320/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1070/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1027/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	860/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	3	0	0	4	3	3.40	650/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KU, THERESE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 214  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1407/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1303/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	1	2	0	2.71	1404/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1054/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1201/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1320/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1070/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	1	0	1	6	3.80	1027/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	860/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	3	0	0	4	3	3.40	650/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 215  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	2	4	3.77	1248/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1280/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1153/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1138/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	2	4	1	3.18	1228/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1220/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1101/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	4	0	3.36	1277/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	813/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1137/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1002/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1110/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	856/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1048/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	978/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	760/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	4	1	3	3.18	701/788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 215  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 216  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	2	4	3.77	1248/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1280/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1153/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1138/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	2	4	1	3.18	1228/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1220/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1101/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	5	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1437/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1307/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1354/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1145/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1017/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1048/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	978/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	760/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	4	1	3	3.18	701/788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 216  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 217  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	2	4	3.77	1248/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1280/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1153/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1138/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	2	4	1	3.18	1228/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1220/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1101/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	973/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	648/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1238/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	683/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	492/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1032/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1048/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	978/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	760/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	4	1	3	3.18	701/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 217  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, TOM (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 218  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	2	4	3.77	1248/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	1	3.62	1280/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1153/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1138/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	4	2	4	1	3.18	1228/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1220/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1101/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	609/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	648/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1107/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	459/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	385/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1032/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1048/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	978/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	760/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	1	4	1	3	3.18	701/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMITH, TOM (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 218  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 219  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	8	4	3.83	1206/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	1160/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	988/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1224/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	633/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1248/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	836/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	855/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	739/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	919/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	733/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	994/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	570/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1059/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	821/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	876/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	3	4	4	3.33	671/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 220  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	8	4	3.83	1206/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	1160/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	988/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1224/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	633/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1248/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	836/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	855/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	3	5	0	3.30	1294/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	1049/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	1277/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1002/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1170/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	894/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1059/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	821/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	876/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	3	4	4	3.33	671/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SHIU, BRIAN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 221  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	8	4	3.83	1206/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	1160/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	988/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1224/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	633/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1248/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	836/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	855/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1046/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1008/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	910/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1017/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1059/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	821/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	876/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	3	4	4	3.33	671/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: KU, THERESE (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 222  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	8	4	3.83	1206/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	1160/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	6	7	3.89	988/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1224/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	633/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1248/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	836/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	855/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	4	6	0	3.36	1277/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	823/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	910/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1017/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1059/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	821/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	876/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	3	1	3	4	4	3.33	671/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	General 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 7	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 0	
				Other	13

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0106  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 223  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	3	6	3	3.60	1324/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	2	3.53	1309/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	2	6	1	3.07	1187/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1175/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	782/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1011/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1210/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	5	6	1	3.54	1212/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	968/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	728/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	819/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	1204/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	5	5	3	3.47	914/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	958/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	680/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	876/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	622/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0106  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 223  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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 101 0106  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 224  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	3	6	3	3.60	1324/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	2	3.53	1309/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	2	6	1	3.07	1187/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1175/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	782/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1011/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1210/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	4	1	3.33	1285/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1031/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1196/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	3	1	4	0	3.13	1304/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	972/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	958/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	680/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	876/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	622/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0106  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 224  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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 101 0106  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 225  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	3	6	3	3.60	1324/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	2	3.53	1309/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	2	6	1	3.07	1187/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1175/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	782/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1011/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1210/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1055/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	968/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	855/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1165/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1032/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	958/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	680/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	876/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	622/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0106  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 225  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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 101 0107  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 226  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1168/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1242/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	3	4	4	3.11	1183/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1333/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	603/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1330/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	1063/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	2	0	0	14	4.41	1107/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	836/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	4	2	10	4.00	1152/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	1153/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1135/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	1101/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	0	2	3	8	3.81	753/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	610/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	652/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	496/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	3	0	1	1	10	4.00	394/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 226  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 227  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1168/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1242/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	3	4	4	3.11	1183/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1333/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	603/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1330/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	1063/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	2	0	0	14	4.41	1107/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1081/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1218/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	2	2	0	6	4.00	1296/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	2	0	2	4	3.67	1196/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	2	2	0	1	4	3.33	1269/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	739/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	610/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	652/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	496/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	3	0	1	1	10	4.00	394/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 227  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SHIU, BRIAN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 228  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	5	5	7	3.89	1168/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	5	6	3.68	1242/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	6	3	4	4	3.11	1183/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1333/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	603/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1330/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	1063/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	2	0	0	14	4.41	1107/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	761/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	839/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1238/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	636/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	791/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	590/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	4	9	4.20	610/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	652/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	496/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	3	0	1	1	10	4.00	394/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0107  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SHIU, BRIAN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 228  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0108  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 229  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	3	6	4.09	1012/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	801/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	795/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1087/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	633/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	1155/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	914/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1294/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	935/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	997/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1096/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1017/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	487/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	855/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	978/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	901/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	596/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.55	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0108  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 230  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	3	6	4.09	1012/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	801/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	795/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1087/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	633/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	1155/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	914/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	753/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	791/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	487/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	855/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	978/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	901/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	596/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.55	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0108  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 231  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	3	6	4.09	1012/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	801/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	795/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1087/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	633/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	1155/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	914/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	997/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	899/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	421/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	487/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	855/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	978/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	901/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	596/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.55	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0109  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 232  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	6	5	3.60	1324/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	6	7	3.65	1259/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	8	3.55	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	7	6	2	3.35	1311/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	9	5	3.80	877/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1071/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	8	3.90	1048/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	4	8	2	3.73	1115/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	739/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	861/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	601/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	977/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	518/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	563/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	2	10	4.00	895/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	2	7	7	3.95	950/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	382/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	4.05	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0109  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 233  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	6	5	3.60	1324/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	6	7	3.65	1259/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	8	3.55	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	7	6	2	3.35	1311/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	9	5	3.80	877/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1071/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	8	3.90	1048/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	8	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1398/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	4	2	1	0	5	3.00	1356/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	3	1	1	1	7	3.62	1360/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	2	1	2	3	2.83	1354/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	2	2	1	1	4	3.30	1275/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1041/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	563/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	2	10	4.00	895/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	2	7	7	3.95	950/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	382/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	4.05	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0109  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: ZUKOWKI, ELI (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 234  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	6	5	3.60	1324/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	6	7	3.65	1259/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	8	3.55	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	7	6	2	3.35	1311/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	9	5	3.80	877/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1071/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	8	3.90	1048/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	1184/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1068/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	963/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	659/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	766/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	739/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	563/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	2	10	4.00	895/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	2	7	7	3.95	950/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	382/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	4.05	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0109  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SHIU, BRAIN (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 235  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	6	5	3.60	1324/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	6	7	3.65	1259/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	8	3.55	1107/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	7	6	2	3.35	1311/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	9	5	3.80	877/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	1071/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	8	3.90	1048/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	945/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	813/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1031/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	659/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	681/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	4	2	5	3.83	739/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	563/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	2	10	4.00	895/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	3	2	7	7	3.95	950/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	382/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	4.05	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0110  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 236  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	11	9	4.00	1069/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	8	7	3.81	1179/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	5	3.65	1083/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1265/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	484/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1039/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	3	10	7	3.91	1039/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	7	9	2	3.72	1124/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	450/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	899/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	9	8	7	3.84	1125/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	4	7	9	3.83	1110/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	4	2	10	3.95	651/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	13	4.04	697/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	532/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	3	8	13	4.23	785/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	5	5	10	3.72	544/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B 14			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 26	Non-major 26
84-150	3	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 20		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0110  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PAPPENMEIER, DOU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 237  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	11	9	4.00	1069/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	8	7	3.81	1179/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	5	3.65	1083/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1265/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	484/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1039/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	3	10	7	3.91	1039/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	7	5	2	3.53	1212/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	588/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	1184/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	984/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	2	10	4.12	977/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	1038/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	13	4.04	697/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	532/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	3	8	13	4.23	785/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	5	5	10	3.72	544/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B 14			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 26	Non-major 26
84-150	3	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 20		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0110  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: SMIT, TOM (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 238  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	11	9	4.00	1069/1481	3.74	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	8	7	3.81	1179/1481	3.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	5	3.65	1083/1249	3.52	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	3	3	4	3	3.54	1265/1424	3.38	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	5	6	11	4.27	484/1396	3.84	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1039/1342	3.46	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	3	3	10	7	3.91	1039/1459	3.85	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	931/1450	3.52	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	739/1409	4.30	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1019/1407	4.49	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	846/1399	4.03	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	836/1400	3.84	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1038/1179	3.61	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	13	4.04	697/1262	3.59	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	532/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	3	8	13	4.23	785/1256	4.13	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	3	5	5	10	3.72	544/ 788	3.49	3.47	4.00	3.80	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B 14			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 26	Non-major 26
84-150	3	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 20		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 222  
 Questionnaires: 127

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 239  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	17	35	71	4.35	739/1481	4.36	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	9	38	80	4.56	458/1481	4.57	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	8	43	73	4.45	573/1249	4.49	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	92	1	2	3	11	16	4.18	818/1424	4.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	3	22	34	54	4.23	519/1396	4.22	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	107	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	****/1342	****	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	9	24	94	4.67	276/1459	4.65	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	1	2	122	4.97	281/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	1	5	45	59	4.44	417/1450	4.51	3.65	4.09	3.97	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	22	101	4.77	400/1409	4.81	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	119	4.94	350/1407	4.93	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	35	84	4.61	459/1399	4.64	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	27	91	4.66	433/1400	4.62	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	72	6	4	8	13	21	3.75	793/1179	3.57	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	99	0	1	2	6	9	10	3.89	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	98	0	1	2	6	3	17	4.14	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	101	0	3	1	6	5	11	3.77	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	99	18	4	0	3	1	2	2.70	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	123	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	124	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	124	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	125	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	125	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	123	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	124	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	124	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	125	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	125	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	124	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	125	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	124	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	125	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	125	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	122	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	122	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	123	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	123	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	123	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 222  
 Questionnaires: 127

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 239  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	44	0.00-0.99	1	A	47	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	38	1.00-1.99	0	B	45						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	14	C	21	General	2	Under-grad	127	Non-major	120
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	28	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	47	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	113				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 236  
 Questionnaires: 97

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 240  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	12	29	52	4.38	708/1481	4.36	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	23	64	4.58	434/1481	4.57	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	5	29	58	4.52	479/1249	4.49	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	73	2	1	4	4	11	3.95	****/1424	4.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	2	3	11	25	40	4.21	545/1396	4.22	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	75	1	2	3	4	9	3.95	****/1342	****	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	1	19	70	4.63	321/1459	4.65	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	1	91	4.96	351/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	4	26	49	4.57	289/1450	4.51	3.65	4.09	3.97	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	12	82	4.85	261/1409	4.81	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	88	4.93	400/1407	4.93	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	20	69	4.68	349/1399	4.64	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	10	14	69	4.58	521/1400	4.62	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	50	6	6	8	11	12	3.40	948/1179	3.57	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	80	0	2	1	6	4	4	3.41	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	79	0	0	2	7	4	5	3.67	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	79	0	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	78	13	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	94	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	94	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	95	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	95	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	95	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	95	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	95	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	96	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	96	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	96	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	96	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	96	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	96	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	96	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201  
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.  
 Enrollment: 236  
 Questionnaires: 97

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 240  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	20	0.00-0.99	1	A	36	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	31	1.00-1.99	1	B	26						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	9	C	23	General	1	Under-grad	97	Non-major	91
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	37	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	84				
				?	6						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 241  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	6	5	1	2.94	1462/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	2.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	10	2	1	2.78	1456/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	2	5	3	0	2.75	1218/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	4	4	2	3.00	1361/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	7	4	2	3.12	1266/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	7	3	1	2.81	1316/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	6	3	1	2.81	1411/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	2.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	421/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	5	6	0	3.14	1333/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	2.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	5	3	7	2	3.35	1321/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	2	6	5	3.59	1364/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	5	6	2	3.18	1306/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	2.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	6	3	1	2.76	1347/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	4	3	0	2.73	1199/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	3	2	0	2.44	1229/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	3	1	0	2.22	1240/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	2	4	2	3.18	236/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	3	2	4	1	3.09	228/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	184/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	4	1	2	2	2.82	222/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	2.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	4	0	2	5	0	2.73	204/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	2.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 7	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 18
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 16

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 242  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	6	5	1	2.94	1462/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	2.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	10	2	1	2.78	1456/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	2	2	5	3	0	2.75	1218/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	4	4	2	3.00	1361/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	7	4	2	3.12	1266/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	7	3	1	2.81	1316/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	6	3	1	2.81	1411/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	2.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	421/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	4	5	0	0	2.17	1441/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	2.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	0	4	3	0	2.70	1390/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	2	2	2	1	2	2.89	1401/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	3	3	0	1	2.44	1385/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	2.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	3	1	0	2.33	1383/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	4	3	0	2.73	1199/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	3	2	0	2.44	1229/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	3	1	0	2.22	1240/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	2	4	2	3.18	236/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	3	2	4	1	3.09	228/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	184/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	4	1	2	2	2.82	222/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	2.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	4	0	2	5	0	2.73	204/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	2.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 7	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 18
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 16

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 243  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	5	5	4	3.35	1401/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	7	4	3.45	1342/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	5	5	3	1	2.75	1218/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	928/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	5	4	5	3.32	1176/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1079/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	5	5	5	3.35	1312/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	855/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	7	4	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	4	6	5	3.50	1293/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	5	2	2	10	3.75	1344/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	4	4	5	3.30	1285/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	3	3	3	4	2.70	1353/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1114/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	0	3	2	3.00	1146/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1209/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1229/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	1	3	3	6	3.50	212/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	196/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	113/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	129/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	146/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.81	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: LING, YUN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 244  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	5	5	4	3.35	1401/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	7	4	3.45	1342/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	5	5	3	1	2.75	1218/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	928/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	5	4	5	3.32	1176/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1079/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	5	5	5	3.35	1312/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	855/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	702/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1134/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	1	6	7	4.13	1290/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	10	3	3.88	1110/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1173/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	0	3	2	3.00	1146/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1209/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1229/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	1	3	3	6	3.50	212/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	196/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	113/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	129/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	146/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.81	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 245  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	8	6	1	3.35	1401/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	6	0	3.22	1390/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	4	2	4	0	3.00	1193/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	9	3	2	3.12	1352/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	10	1	3.47	1098/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1217/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	6	4	4	0	2.53	1428/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	2.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	4	8	0	1	2.71	1413/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	4	7	3	1	2.82	1382/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	3	8	2	3	3.18	1390/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	6	4	4	0	2.53	1379/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	8	1	2	2.76	1347/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1150/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	4	0	0	2.00	1245/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	5	3	0	0	2.22	1243/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1245/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	197/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	172/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	107/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	113/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	139/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.91	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 246  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	8	6	1	3.35	1401/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	6	0	3.22	1390/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	4	2	4	0	3.00	1193/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	9	3	2	3.12	1352/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	10	1	3.47	1098/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1217/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	6	4	4	0	2.53	1428/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	2.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	599/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1110/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1315/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	8	1	6	3.75	1163/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	8	2	5	3.69	1176/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	945/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	4	0	0	2.00	1245/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	5	3	0	0	2.22	1243/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1245/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	197/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	172/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	107/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	113/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	139/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.91	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 247  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	2	2.95	1460/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	2.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	3	4	2	2.57	1466/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	8	5	1	0	2.31	1243/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	7	7	1	3.11	1353/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	7	5	3	3.05	1284/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	5	3	7	2	3.11	1256/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	6	7	6	3.71	1177/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	4	2	9	3	1	2.74	1409/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	4	5	5	3	2.95	1366/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	4	7	5	5	3.52	1370/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	6	5	4	2	2.71	1367/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	7	5	5	2	2	2.38	1378/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1254/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	1.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	1	1	0	1	2.00	1247/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	4	4	4	5	3.32	229/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.32	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	2	4	3	7	3	3.26	223/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.26	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	1	3	6	7	3.79	219/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	181/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	3	3	3	8	1	3.06	197/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.06	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: RIVERA, LIZETTE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 248  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	2	2.95	1460/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	2.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	7	3	4	2	2.57	1466/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	8	5	1	0	2.31	1243/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	7	7	1	3.11	1353/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	7	5	3	3.05	1284/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	5	3	7	2	3.11	1256/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	6	7	6	3.71	1177/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	3	11	2	3.72	1124/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	6	6	1	3.31	1329/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	3	5	4	3	3.31	1383/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	4	6	2	3.31	1282/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	4	4	4	2	3.13	1302/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1254/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	1.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	4	1	1	0	1	2.00	1247/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	4	4	4	5	3.32	229/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.32	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	2	4	3	7	3	3.26	223/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.26	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	1	3	6	7	3.79	219/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	181/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	3	3	3	8	1	3.06	197/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.06	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 249  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	4	7	3	3.10	1442/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	7	3	3	2.95	1431/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	2	3	6	0	3.00	1193/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	4	9	1	2	2.83	1393/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	6	7	2	3.15	1245/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	5	5	2	2.95	1289/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	8	5	2	2	2.68	1418/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	2.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	421/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	4	8	3	0	2.61	1421/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	7	4	4	3.32	1329/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	5	7	5	3.68	1351/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	7	3	2	2.79	1359/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	5	7	0	2	2.50	1364/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	1	0	2	1	2.38	1235/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	0	2	1	2	2.67	1221/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	1	2	1	2.88	1196/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	1	4	7	2	3.38	221/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	2	1	5	6	2	3.31	219/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	216/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	5	2	7	3.75	189/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	3	1	7	3	2	3.00	198/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0105  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 250  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	4	7	3	3.10	1442/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	7	3	3	2.95	1431/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	2	3	6	0	3.00	1193/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	4	9	1	2	2.83	1393/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	6	7	2	3.15	1245/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	5	5	2	2.95	1289/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	8	5	2	2	2.68	1418/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	2.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	421/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	6	8	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	7	6	2	3.56	1285/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	1296/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	9	3	2	3.25	1294/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	8	4	3	3.50	1230/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1114/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	1	0	2	1	2.38	1235/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	0	2	1	2	2.67	1221/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	1	2	1	2.88	1196/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	1	4	7	2	3.38	221/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	2	1	5	6	2	3.31	219/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	216/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	5	2	7	3.75	189/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	3	1	7	3	2	3.00	198/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 251  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	7	5	6	3.50	1358/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	9	4	2	3.00	1420/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	3	1	4	2	0	2.50	1236/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	5	6	6	1	3.05	1357/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	6	3	8	3	3.29	1188/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	6	7	4	3.55	1093/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	8	4	3	3.09	1370/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	3	4	7	1	1	2.56	1424/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	8	7	2	3.18	1345/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	9	5	3	3.18	1389/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	4	7	6	2	3.00	1325/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	7	4	5	0	2.36	1380/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	4	0	1	2.44	1229/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	3	2	0	1	2.22	1243/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	4	3	2	0	0	1.78	1250/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	1.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	2	8	6	5	3.67	202/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	3	2	4	7	6	3.50	196/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	163/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.32	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	3	2	7	9	4.05	159/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.05	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	2	2	8	7	2	3.24	187/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	19	
?	0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 252  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	7	5	6	3.50	1358/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	9	4	2	3.00	1420/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	3	1	4	2	0	2.50	1236/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	5	6	6	1	3.05	1357/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	6	3	8	3	3.29	1188/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	6	7	4	3.55	1093/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	8	4	3	3.09	1370/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	8	3	2	3.54	1212/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1068/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	1315/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	1170/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	5	6	1	3.27	1281/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1128/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	4	0	1	2.44	1229/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	3	2	0	1	2.22	1243/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	4	3	2	0	0	1.78	1250/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	1.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	2	8	6	5	3.67	202/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	3	2	4	7	6	3.50	196/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	163/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.32	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	3	2	7	9	4.05	159/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.05	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	2	2	8	7	2	3.24	187/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		Non-major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	19	
?	0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 253  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	3	4	3.41	1383/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	2	6	3.24	1388/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	4	3	2	1	2.54	1233/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	2	4	2	2	2.85	1392/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1098/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	0	4	4	3.50	1115/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	1109/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	743/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	5	3	0	2.69	1415/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	8	3	3	3.29	1333/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	7	6	2	3.56	1366/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	7	4	2	3.06	1320/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	4	3	2	2.59	1357/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	3	0	2	2	1	2.75	1104/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1200/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1217/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1220/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	208/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	179/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	168/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	154/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	0	0	8	2	3.67	160/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 9					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	14			
				? 0					

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: RIVERA, LIZETTE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 254  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	3	4	3.41	1383/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	2	6	3.24	1388/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	4	3	2	1	2.54	1233/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	2	4	2	2	2.85	1392/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1098/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	0	4	4	3.50	1115/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	1109/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	743/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	959/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	1031/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1328/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1002/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1211/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1200/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1217/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1220/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	0	2	5	3	3.58	208/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	179/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	168/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	154/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	0	0	8	2	3.67	160/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 9					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	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	14			
				? 0					

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 255  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	6	2	3.06	1446/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	8	2	3.28	1380/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	5	1	1	3	0	2.20	1244/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	5	2	5	3.06	1357/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	5	2	3	2.78	1343/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	2.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	6	4	4	3.22	1215/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	6	4	5	3.44	1280/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	729/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	3	5	0	2.92	1382/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	1	7	4	2	2.94	1368/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	2	4	4	4	3.11	1395/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	1	7	5	1	2.89	1349/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	3	4	1	2	2.22	1388/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	1153/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1117/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	1	0	2	2	2.88	1190/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	1	1	0	3	2.88	1196/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	181/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	182/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	182/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	113/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	175/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 255  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: LING, YUN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 256  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	6	2	3.06	1446/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	8	2	3.28	1380/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	5	1	1	3	0	2.20	1244/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	5	2	5	3.06	1357/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	5	2	3	2.78	1343/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	2.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	6	4	4	3.22	1215/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	6	4	5	3.44	1280/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	729/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	135/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	693/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	861/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	613/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	397/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	726/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1117/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	1	0	2	2	2.88	1190/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	1	1	0	3	2.88	1196/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	181/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	182/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	182/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	113/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	175/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: LING, YUN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 256  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 257  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	2	6	5	3.35	1401/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	6	6	2	3.05	1416/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	9	0	5	2	2	2.33	1242/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	4	3	6	4	2	2.84	1392/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	4	6	3	3.10	1272/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	5	2	8	1	3.06	1262/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	3	6	4	3.15	1358/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	12	2	0	2.68	1416/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	2	2	7	4	3.26	1336/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	5	3	3	2	6	3.05	1396/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	2	2	6	4	3.11	1316/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	1	6	4	2	2.83	1341/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	6	0	2	0	0	1.50	1175/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	1.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	0	4	5	6	3.61	206/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.61	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	4	1	3	5	5	3.33	216/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	2	1	9	5	3.83	213/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	168/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	3	2	3	5	5	3.39	176/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.39	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

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
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 21
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 17

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MENDEZ, LORYN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 258  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	2	6	5	3.35	1401/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	6	6	2	3.05	1416/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	9	0	5	2	2	2.33	1242/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	4	3	6	4	2	2.84	1392/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	4	6	3	3.10	1272/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	5	2	8	1	3.06	1262/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	3	3	6	4	3.15	1358/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	578/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1211/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	1296/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	2	1	2	5	3.50	1237/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1269/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	1.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	0	4	5	6	3.61	206/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.61	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	4	1	3	5	5	3.33	216/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	2	1	9	5	3.83	213/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	168/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	3	2	3	5	5	3.39	176/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.39	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

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
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 21
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 17

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 259  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	7	0	2.68	1474/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	2.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	2	5	5	1	2.72	1460/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	2	3	4	0	2.67	1226/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	4	6	0	2.67	1406/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	7	3	2	3.13	1261/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	3	6	2	3.27	1205/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	4	3	5	3.11	1366/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	4	7	2	1	2.87	1390/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	2.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	5	6	4	3	3.16	1348/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1381/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	9	3	1	2.89	1348/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	10	4	1	3	1	2.00	1393/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1245/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	1	5	3	4	3.25	233/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	187/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	216/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	4	3	3	5	3.60	197/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	194/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 259  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 260  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	7	0	2.68	1474/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	2.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	2	5	5	1	2.72	1460/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	2	3	4	0	2.67	1226/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	4	6	0	2.67	1406/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	7	3	2	3.13	1261/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	3	6	2	3.27	1205/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	4	3	5	3.11	1366/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	6	5	0	3.07	1346/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	2.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	3	3	4	3.67	1270/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	4	2	3	2	2.92	1400/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	4	7	0	3.23	1297/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	3	2	2	3.00	1312/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1245/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	3	1	5	3	4	3.25	233/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	6	6	3	3.69	187/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	216/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	4	3	3	5	3.60	197/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	194/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 260  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 261  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	7	6	3.94	1124/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	3	5	3.50	1320/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	5	2	5	1	2.75	1218/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1123/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	985/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1049/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	7	2	7	3.67	1201/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	1	4	4	0	3.10	1343/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	8	3	3.71	1264/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	3	3	8	3.78	1342/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	6	3	4	3.35	1272/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	5	5	1	2.72	1351/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	148/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	178/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.76	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	74/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	1	1	4	9	4.00	161/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	109/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 262  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	7	6	3.94	1124/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	3	5	3.50	1320/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	5	2	5	1	2.75	1218/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1123/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	985/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1049/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	7	2	7	3.67	1201/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1081/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	878/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1176/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	828/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	867/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	148/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	178/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.76	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	74/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	1	1	4	9	4.00	161/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	109/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 263  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	2	9	7	1	3.25	1421/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	10	3	1	2.80	1454/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	4	5	1	0	2.55	1233/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	4	6	3	0	2.56	1410/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	8	4	2	3.17	1239/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	7	2	2	2.82	1315/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	8	3	3.60	1228/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	0	18	4.80	839/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	6	7	3	0	2.61	1421/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	4	6	3	4	3.16	1348/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	5	5	4	3	2.95	1399/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	7	5	6	1	2.95	1336/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	5	6	2	1	2.35	1382/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	4	3	4	0	0	2.00	1156/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	2	2	0	2.43	1231/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	0	3	0	0	1.75	1254/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	1.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	1233/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	2	6	1	5	3.47	214/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	4	5	2	4	3.40	206/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	196/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	178/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	8	4	2	3.47	169/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.47	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 263  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 264  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	2	9	7	1	3.25	1421/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	10	3	1	2.80	1454/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	4	5	1	0	2.55	1233/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	2.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	3	4	6	3	0	2.56	1410/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	8	4	2	3.17	1239/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	7	2	2	2.82	1315/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	2.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	8	3	3.60	1228/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	0	18	4.80	839/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	931/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1152/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1356/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1203/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	7	2	3	3.29	1278/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	997/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	2	2	0	2.43	1231/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	2.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	0	3	0	0	1.75	1254/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	1.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	1	2	0	2.33	1233/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	2	6	1	5	3.47	214/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	4	5	2	4	3.40	206/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	5	3	6	3.93	196/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	178/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	8	4	2	3.47	169/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.47	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 264  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 265  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	1	8	3	3	3.11	1440/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	6	4	2	3.00	1420/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	8	2	4	0	1	1.93	1247/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	1.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	6	8	2	3.59	1248/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1282/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1011/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	1013/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	3	3	3	1	2.83	1394/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	2	4	3	3	2.94	1370/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	5	2	3	4	3.13	1394/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	3	4	3	3	3.00	1325/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	3	4	2	1	2.31	1385/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1140/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	4	0	3	3.00	1146/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1226/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	3	2	1	1	2.40	1227/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	755/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	242/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	2.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	206/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	184/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	174/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	147/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 265  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	2	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 266  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	1	8	3	3	3.11	1440/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	6	4	2	3.00	1420/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	8	2	4	0	1	1.93	1247/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	1.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	6	8	2	3.59	1248/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1282/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	3.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1011/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	1013/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	973/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1245/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1342/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1237/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1287/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	2.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	4	0	3	3.00	1146/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1226/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	3	2	1	1	2.40	1227/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	2.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	755/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	2	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	242/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	2.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	206/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	184/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	1	2	0	6	3.90	174/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	147/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 266  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	2	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 267  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	8	2	8	3.75	1254/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	6	3.75	1205/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	2	2	6	5	3.32	1151/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	959/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	643/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1115/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	5	5	7	3.79	1136/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	0	17	4.74	896/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	4	9	0	3.40	1267/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1185/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	1285/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	1049/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	7	5	3.60	1204/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	3	1	4	2	0	2.50	1128/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1010/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1107/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	3	6	2	3.36	1131/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	200/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.69	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	164/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	216/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	161/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	122/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 267  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	2	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 268  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	8	2	8	3.75	1254/1481	3.27	3.84	4.29	4.14	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	6	3.75	1205/1481	3.09	3.75	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	2	2	6	5	3.32	1151/1249	2.61	3.62	4.27	4.14	3.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	959/1424	3.18	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	4	10	4.11	643/1396	3.28	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	1115/1342	3.28	3.67	4.07	3.88	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	5	5	7	3.79	1136/1459	3.34	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	0	17	4.74	896/1480	4.93	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	945/1450	3.32	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	1092/1409	3.58	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	1137/1407	3.64	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1002/1399	3.35	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1074/1400	3.04	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	760/1179	2.60	3.53	3.96	3.85	3.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1010/1262	2.60	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	1107/1259	2.51	3.65	4.29	4.06	3.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	3	6	2	3.36	1131/1256	2.48	3.62	4.30	4.08	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 788	2.60	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	2	4	3	6	3.69	200/ 246	3.52	4.04	4.20	3.93	3.69	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	164/ 249	3.53	4.01	4.11	3.95	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	216/ 242	4.10	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	161/ 240	3.94	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	122/ 217	3.50	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114  
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I  
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 268  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	2	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
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	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 124 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: LEASE, RICHARD  
 Enrollment: 68  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 269  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	16	17	4.32	769/1481	4.32	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	10	14	13	4.03	991/1481	4.03	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	16	17	4.24	757/1249	4.24	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	818/1424	4.19	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	2	4	10	15	4.23	527/1396	4.23	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1342	****	3.67	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	10	9	18	4.16	863/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	15	10	5	3.61	1184/1450	3.61	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	10	22	4.42	865/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	14	20	4.42	1168/1407	4.42	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	11	14	12	3.97	1030/1399	3.97	3.84	4.26	4.23	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	5	14	15	4.05	1001/1400	4.05	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	3	5	11	17	4.17	510/1179	4.17	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	34	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 39 Non-major 39
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 10	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 34	
			? 4		

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 270  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	587/1481	4.69	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	349/1481	4.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	611/1249	4.56	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	557/1424	4.57	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	193/1396	4.63	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	166/1342	4.69	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	505/1459	4.49	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	743/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	311/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	3.97	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	304/1409	4.18	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	545/1407	4.39	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	145/1399	4.34	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	374/1400	4.13	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	566/1179	4.21	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	887/1262	4.25	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	895/1259	4.50	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	723/1256	4.54	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	35/ 246	4.84	4.04	4.20	3.93	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	23/ 249	4.78	4.01	4.11	3.95	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	67/ 242	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	191/ 240	3.93	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	40/ 217	4.67	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 270  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
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 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 271  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	587/1481	4.69	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	349/1481	4.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	611/1249	4.56	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	557/1424	4.57	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	193/1396	4.63	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	166/1342	4.69	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	505/1459	4.49	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	743/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1174/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	3.97	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1110/1409	4.18	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1069/1407	4.39	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	947/1399	4.34	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.13	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1179	4.21	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	887/1262	4.25	3.46	4.05	3.77	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	895/1259	4.50	3.65	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	723/1256	4.54	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	35/ 246	4.84	4.04	4.20	3.93	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	23/ 249	4.78	4.01	4.11	3.95	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	67/ 242	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	191/ 240	3.93	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	40/ 217	4.67	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 271  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
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 14	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 272  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1481	4.69	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	92/1481	4.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1249	4.56	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	240/1424	4.57	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	193/1396	4.63	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	101/1342	4.69	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1459	4.49	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	3.97	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	150/1409	4.18	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	4.39	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1399	4.34	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	299/1400	4.13	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	111/1179	4.21	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	205/1262	4.25	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	4.50	3.65	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.54	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 246	4.84	4.04	4.20	3.93	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	27/ 249	4.78	4.01	4.11	3.95	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	36/ 242	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	147/ 240	3.93	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	37/ 217	4.67	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 273  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1481	4.69	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	92/1481	4.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	298/1249	4.56	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	240/1424	4.57	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	193/1396	4.63	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	101/1342	4.69	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1459	4.49	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	3.97	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1122/1409	4.18	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1296/1407	4.39	4.21	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.34	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1204/1400	4.13	3.69	4.27	4.19	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	760/1179	4.21	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	205/1262	4.25	3.46	4.05	3.77	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	4.50	3.65	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.54	3.62	4.30	4.08	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 246	4.84	4.04	4.20	3.93	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	27/ 249	4.78	4.01	4.11	3.95	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	36/ 242	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.33	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	147/ 240	3.93	3.84	4.20	4.20	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	37/ 217	4.67	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 274  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	3	15	4.68	373/1481	4.69	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	493/1481	4.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	432/1249	4.56	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	364/1424	4.57	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	263/1396	4.63	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	290/1342	4.69	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	863/1459	4.49	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	334/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	682/1409	4.18	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	18	4.79	766/1407	4.39	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	491/1399	4.34	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	624/1400	4.13	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	518/1179	4.21	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1262	4.25	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1259	4.50	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1256	4.54	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	53/ 246	4.84	4.04	4.20	3.93	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	56/ 249	4.78	4.01	4.11	3.95	4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	7	6	3	3.65	226/ 242	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.65	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	183/ 240	3.93	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	66/ 217	4.67	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103  
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA  
 Instructor: VAUILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 275  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	3	15	4.68	373/1481	4.69	3.84	4.29	4.14	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	493/1481	4.70	3.75	4.23	4.18	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	432/1249	4.56	3.62	4.27	4.14	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	364/1424	4.57	3.68	4.21	4.06	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	263/1396	4.63	3.74	3.98	3.89	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	290/1342	4.69	3.67	4.07	3.88	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	863/1459	4.49	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	5	9	2	1	2.94	1373/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	3.97	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	3	3	0	0	2.50	1395/1409	4.18	4.09	4.42	4.36	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1394/1407	4.39	4.21	4.69	4.57	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1255/1399	4.34	3.84	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	4	0	0	2.50	1364/1400	4.13	3.69	4.27	4.19	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1179	4.21	3.53	3.96	3.85	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1262	4.25	3.46	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1259	4.50	3.65	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1256	4.54	3.62	4.30	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	53/ 246	4.84	4.04	4.20	3.93	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	56/ 249	4.78	4.01	4.11	3.95	4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	7	6	3	3.65	226/ 242	4.43	4.34	4.40	4.33	3.65	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	183/ 240	3.93	3.84	4.20	4.20	3.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	66/ 217	4.67	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 20
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 17

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 276  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	3	7	4.00	1069/1481	3.75	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1070/1481	3.85	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	3	5	3.65	1086/1249	3.70	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	959/1424	4.25	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	675/1396	3.90	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1248/1342	3.73	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	845/1459	3.96	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.94	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	836/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	113/1409	4.48	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.71	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	733/1399	4.38	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1001/1400	4.21	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	746/1179	3.77	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	123/ 246	4.40	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	48/ 249	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 242	4.78	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 240	4.92	3.84	4.20	3.96	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	81/ 217	4.62	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 1	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 14
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: HANKUS, MIKELLA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 277  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	3	7	4.00	1069/1481	3.75	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1070/1481	3.85	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	3	5	3.65	1086/1249	3.70	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	959/1424	4.25	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	675/1396	3.90	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1248/1342	3.73	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	845/1459	3.96	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.94	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	973/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	4.48	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1031/1407	4.71	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.38	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	704/1400	4.21	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	860/1179	3.77	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	123/ 246	4.40	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	48/ 249	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 242	4.78	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 240	4.92	3.84	4.20	3.96	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	81/ 217	4.62	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 1	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 14
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: TURNER, KEVIN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 278  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	3	7	4.00	1069/1481	3.75	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1070/1481	3.85	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	3	5	3.65	1086/1249	3.70	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	959/1424	4.25	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	675/1396	3.90	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1248/1342	3.73	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	845/1459	3.96	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.94	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	473/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	648/1409	4.48	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.71	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	459/1399	4.38	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	704/1400	4.21	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	760/1179	3.77	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	123/ 246	4.40	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	48/ 249	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 242	4.78	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 240	4.92	3.84	4.20	3.96	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	81/ 217	4.62	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 279  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1358/1481	3.75	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1205/1481	3.85	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1046/1249	3.70	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.25	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	918/1396	3.90	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	3.73	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.96	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	743/1480	4.94	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1014/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	924/1409	4.48	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1107/1407	4.71	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1002/1399	4.38	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1017/1400	4.21	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	712/1179	3.77	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 246	4.40	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	136/ 249	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	84/ 242	4.78	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	47/ 240	4.92	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 217	4.62	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: HANKUS, MIKELLA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 280  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1358/1481	3.75	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1205/1481	3.85	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1046/1249	3.70	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.25	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	918/1396	3.90	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	3.73	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.96	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	743/1480	4.94	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1189/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1409	4.48	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1407	4.71	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1399	4.38	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1400	4.21	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 246	4.40	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	136/ 249	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	84/ 242	4.78	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	47/ 240	4.92	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 217	4.62	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.83

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 8
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 6

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102  
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: TURNER, KEVIN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 281  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1358/1481	3.75	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1205/1481	3.85	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1046/1249	3.70	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.25	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	918/1396	3.90	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	474/1342	3.73	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.96	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	743/1480	4.94	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	4.48	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1407	4.71	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	753/1399	4.38	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1400	4.21	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	3.77	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	74/ 246	4.40	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	136/ 249	4.43	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	84/ 242	4.78	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	47/ 240	4.92	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 217	4.62	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101  
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 282  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	10	4.71	340/1481	4.71	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	349/1481	4.64	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	432/1249	4.57	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	740/1424	4.25	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	839/1396	3.86	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	238/1342	4.60	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	81/1459	4.93	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	855/1480	4.79	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	662/1450	4.22	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	671/1399	4.42	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	692/1400	4.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	464/1179	4.22	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101  
 Title PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.  
 Enrollment: 62  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 283  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	2	5	11	7	3.81	1225/1481	3.81	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	7	8	8	3.81	1179/1481	3.81	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	10	4.08	865/1249	4.08	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	959/1424	4.00	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	5	8	9	3.77	909/1396	3.77	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	3	0	3	2	4	3.33	1186/1342	3.33	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	7	6	11	4.04	940/1459	4.04	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	281/1480	4.96	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	7	13	3	3.68	1151/1450	3.68	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	9	14	4.35	957/1409	4.35	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	861/1407	4.73	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	5	8	7	3.54	1231/1399	3.54	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	5	3	7	9	3.72	1160/1400	3.72	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	2	7	4	10	3.96	641/1179	3.96	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB II  
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 284  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.30	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.30	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	863/1424	4.37	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1239/1396	3.46	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1115/1342	3.95	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	378/1459	4.59	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	836/1450	4.10	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	4.93	4.09	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1031/1407	4.80	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1002/1399	4.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1291/1400	4.33	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	590/1179	4.22	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	862/1262	3.80	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1259	4.60	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1256	4.50	3.62	4.30	4.34	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 246	4.75	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.01	4.11	4.23	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.34	4.40	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	3.84	4.20	3.96	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	3.89	4.04	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101  
 Title ADVANCED LAB II  
 Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 285  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.30	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.30	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	863/1424	4.37	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1239/1396	3.46	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1115/1342	3.95	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	378/1459	4.59	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1450	4.10	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	4.93	4.09	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	4.80	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	4.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	4.33	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1179	4.22	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	862/1262	3.80	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	509/1259	4.60	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1256	4.50	3.62	4.30	4.34	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 246	4.75	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 249	5.00	4.01	4.11	4.23	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 242	5.00	4.34	4.40	4.36	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	3.84	4.20	3.96	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	3.89	4.04	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102  
 Title ADVANCED LAB II  
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 286  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.30	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1481	4.30	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	893/1249	4.00	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	334/1424	4.37	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	918/1396	3.46	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	405/1342	3.95	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	344/1459	4.59	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	217/1450	4.10	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.93	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	683/1399	4.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.33	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	840/1179	4.22	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.75	4.04	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	5.00	4.01	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	5.00	4.34	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	5.00	3.84	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	5.00	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102  
 Title ADVANCED LAB II  
 Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 287  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4.60	461/1481	4.30	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1481	4.30	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	893/1249	4.00	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	334/1424	4.37	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	918/1396	3.46	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	405/1342	3.95	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	344/1459	4.59	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	836/1450	4.10	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1409	4.93	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1407	4.80	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1399	4.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1400	4.33	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.75	4.04	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	5.00	4.01	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	5.00	4.34	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	5.00	3.84	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	5.00	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	

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 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					4

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK  
 Enrollment: 223  
 Questionnaires: 110

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 288  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	6	16	37	46	4.06	1037/1481	4.06	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	9	25	34	35	3.76	1200/1481	3.76	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	13	16	23	26	27	3.36	1142/1249	3.36	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	60	8	2	11	10	18	3.57	1251/1424	3.57	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	4	4	7	27	58	4.31	451/1396	4.31	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	64	4	6	5	12	17	3.73	1005/1342	3.73	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	4	13	27	59	4.24	783/1459	4.24	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	103	4.94	491/1480	4.94	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	3	4	7	27	23	24	3.66	1165/1450	3.66	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	1	11	27	64	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	3	13	89	4.72	880/1407	4.72	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	10	11	26	22	39	3.64	1206/1399	3.64	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	12	16	13	27	39	3.61	1204/1400	3.61	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	12	4	9	22	23	34	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	76	0	6	4	6	5	13	3.44	1018/1262	3.44	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	4	1	2	2	23	4.22	809/1259	4.22	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	79	0	6	0	5	4	16	3.77	1035/1256	3.77	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	79	2	2	2	3	4	18	4.17	330/ 788	4.17	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 42		
56-83	28	2.00-2.99 14	C 35	General 0	Under-grad 110 Non-major 106
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 28	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 91	
			? 9		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 289  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	4	9	4.50	549/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	434/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	865/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	582/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	594/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	713/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	872/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	630/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	682/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	899/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	864/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	898/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	753/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	570/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	895/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	996/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	515/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	123/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.31	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	138/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.15	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	113/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	89/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	45/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.69	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 289  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ABHARI, MOHSEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 290  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	4	9	4.50	549/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	434/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	865/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	582/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	594/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	713/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	872/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	6	1	3.60	1189/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	648/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1238/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	966/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	704/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	570/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	895/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	996/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	515/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	123/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.31	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	138/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.15	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	113/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	89/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	45/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.69	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ABHARI, MOHSEN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 290  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 291  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	1	3.67	1299/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1118/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	846/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	0	3	2	3.38	1305/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	801/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1115/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1142/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1055/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	968/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1221/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	956/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	658/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	793/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1108/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1002/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1025/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	208/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	145/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	177/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	3	0	1	2	3.00	212/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	129/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
Enrollment: 15  
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
Baltimore County  
Spring 2006

Page 291  
JUN 13, 2006  
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 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	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 351L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: DAPHNIS, SUZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 292  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	1	3.67	1299/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1118/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	846/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	0	3	2	3.38	1305/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	801/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1115/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1142/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	1	2	1	3	3.00	1354/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1384/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1388/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1145/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1291/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1108/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1002/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1025/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	208/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	145/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	177/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	3	0	1	2	3.00	212/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	129/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: DAPHNIS, SUZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 292  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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 351L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 293  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	6	4.18	928/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	963/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	460/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	684/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	411/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	405/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1048/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	630/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	603/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	500/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	810/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	754/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	197/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1203/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	139/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	128/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.45	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	97/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	115/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: JENKINS, DANIEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 294  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	6	4.18	928/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	963/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	460/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	684/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	411/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	405/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1048/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	504/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1224/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1292/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1210/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1165/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	860/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	610/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1203/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	139/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	128/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.45	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	97/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	115/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 295  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	7	4.00	1069/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1000/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1001/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1130/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	707/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1011/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1030/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	973/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	1043/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	1137/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	920/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	994/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	984/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	181/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	161/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	152/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	131/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	161/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.64	

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 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	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		
			? 1	Other	11

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: MOTEL, WILLIAM (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 296  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	7	4.00	1069/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	7	4.00	1000/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	6	3.86	1001/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	1130/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	707/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1011/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1030/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	217/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	891/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	704/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	181/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	161/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	152/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	131/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	161/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.64	

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 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	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	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 297  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	4.36	729/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	201/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	718/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	959/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	662/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	638/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	671/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	732/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	483/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	783/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	299/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	753/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	507/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1094/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1167/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	749/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	123/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	76/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	76/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	91/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	81/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
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 0105  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ABHARI, MOHSER (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 298  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	4.36	729/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	201/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	718/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	959/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	662/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	638/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	671/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	546/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	417/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1031/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	335/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	791/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	259/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	507/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1094/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	1167/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	749/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	123/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	76/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	76/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	91/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	81/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
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 0106  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 299  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	6	4	3.63	1315/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	2	3.50	1320/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1066/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	1197/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	869/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	649/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	611/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	5	5	0	3.27	1301/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	727/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1077/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1240/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	813/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1081/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1130/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1128/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	533/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	197/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	125/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	113/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	3	5	1	2	3.00	212/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	118/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.17	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	

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	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: DAPHNIS, SUZE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 300  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	6	4	3.63	1315/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	2	3.50	1320/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	7	3	3	3.71	1066/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	1	6	5	3.73	1197/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	869/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	649/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	611/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	4	0	3.36	1277/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1049/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	3	0	5	1	3.44	1376/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1156/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1306/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1108/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1081/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1130/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1128/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	533/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	197/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	125/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	113/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	3	5	1	2	3.00	212/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	118/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.17	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	

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	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	0			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 301  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	422/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	788/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	717/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	411/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	310/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	630/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	188/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	129/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	250/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	590/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	507/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	987/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	854/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	515/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	66/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	46/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	94/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: JENKINS, DANIEL (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 302  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	422/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	788/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	717/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	411/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	303/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	310/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	334/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1286/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	311/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	591/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	507/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	987/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	854/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	515/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	66/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	46/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	94/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 303  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1206/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1160/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	846/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1074/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	435/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	755/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	854/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	974/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	546/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	559/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1046/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	480/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	511/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	495/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	516/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	291/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	103/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	73/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	102/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.29	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: MOTEL, WILLIAM (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 304  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	1	6	3	3.83	1206/1481	4.08	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1160/1481	4.16	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	846/1249	4.11	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1074/1424	3.98	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	435/1396	4.12	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	755/1342	4.06	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	854/1459	4.16	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	974/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1030/1450	3.99	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	682/1409	4.42	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1245/1407	4.41	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	801/1399	4.26	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	953/1400	4.16	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	259/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	4.05	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	3.77	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	516/1256	3.65	3.62	4.30	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	291/ 788	3.65	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 246	4.18	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 249	4.33	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	103/ 242	4.51	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	73/ 240	4.18	3.84	4.20	3.96	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	102/ 217	4.30	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.29	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 12

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN  
 Enrollment: 120  
 Questionnaires: 83

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 305  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	1	0	7	74	4.88	181/1481	4.66	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	75	4.91	103/1481	4.53	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	72	4.85	172/1249	4.55	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	31	0	0	0	5	46	4.90	136/1424	4.90	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	7	10	58	4.68	185/1396	4.56	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	2	1	2	5	42	4.62	230/1342	4.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	11	70	4.86	125/1459	4.57	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	5	29	46	4.51	1039/1480	4.76	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.51	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	0	1	11	59	4.76	159/1450	4.52	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	75	4.94	131/1409	4.79	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	78	4.97	150/1407	4.85	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	5	73	4.88	153/1399	4.51	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	72	4.86	187/1400	4.45	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	2	5	12	5	42	4.21	472/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	65	0	1	0	2	1	14	4.50	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	66	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	66	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	82	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 39	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 28			
56-83	33	2.00-2.99	6	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 83	Non-major 80
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	22	D 2			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 73		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0201  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II  
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L  
 Enrollment: 138  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 306  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	0	0	0	3	24	26	4.43	639/1481	4.66	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	2	3	32	15	4.15	917/1481	4.53	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	3	24	23	4.25	749/1249	4.55	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	46	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1424	4.90	3.68	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	11	1	0	4	11	25	4.44	355/1396	4.56	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	47	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1342	4.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	8	16	26	4.27	766/1459	4.57	3.86	4.16	4.17	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	2	0	0	0	0	50	5.00	1/1480	4.76	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	1	4	21	18	4.27	609/1450	4.52	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	4	10	36	4.64	588/1409	4.79	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	8	39	4.72	899/1407	4.85	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	11	18	20	4.14	929/1399	4.51	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	5	6	13	24	4.04	1004/1400	4.45	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	25	2	2	10	6	5	3.40	945/1179	3.81	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	48	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	47	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	4.23	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 25		
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General	2
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 12	D 0	Under-grad	57
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 22	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	47
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 307  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	1	3.38	1395/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1408/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1163/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1236/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	193/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1220/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1288/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1189/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1013/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1296/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	3	2	0	2.71	1367/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	1301/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	894/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	226/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	189/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	225/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	229/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	129/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.00	

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	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: SUNKARA, NARESH (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 308  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	1	3.38	1395/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1408/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1163/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1236/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	193/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1220/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1288/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	630/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1356/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1362/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1325/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1312/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	226/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	189/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	225/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	229/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	129/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.00	

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	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 309  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4	3	3.67	1299/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	967/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	810/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1074/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	0	5	2	3.50	1083/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	974/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1276/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1160/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	968/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1176/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	973/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	1145/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	0	1	2	1	2.50	1128/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1196/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1240/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	188/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	161/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	184/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	1	0	3	4	3.36	206/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	146/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	

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	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: CAI, HONGYI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 310  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4	3	3.67	1299/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	967/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	810/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1074/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	0	5	2	3.50	1083/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	974/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1276/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1031/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	823/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1002/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	867/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1196/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1240/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	0	2	1	6	3.82	188/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	161/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	184/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	1	0	3	4	3.36	206/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	146/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	

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	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 311  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	4	3	3.90	1162/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1286/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	980/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	959/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	985/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1071/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1206/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1001/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1031/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1096/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	591/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	945/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1059/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	134/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	114/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	131/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	176/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	140/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.89	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZHAO, CHUMANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 312  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	4	3	3.90	1162/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1286/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	980/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	959/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	985/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1071/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1256/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	334/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1293/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1221/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1183/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1059/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	134/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	114/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	131/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	176/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.89	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	140/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.89	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 313  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	1	6	4	3.57	1334/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	6	2	3.23	1388/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	4	4	3.29	1157/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	1	4	4	3.75	1186/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1206/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	1160/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	1	4	3	3.33	1318/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	1	3	6	1	3.23	1312/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	1131/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	1245/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	6	4	3.71	1178/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	1017/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1041/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1240/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	155/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	145/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	140/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	3	2	3	1	2.67	229/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	3	2	4	2	3.25	186/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.25	

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZEMEK, JOZEF (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 314  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	1	6	4	3.57	1334/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	6	2	3.23	1388/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	4	4	3.29	1157/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	1	4	4	3.75	1186/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1206/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	1160/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	1	4	3	3.33	1318/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	3	2	3.58	1195/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	1356/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1372/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	1389/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1364/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1240/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	155/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	145/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	140/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	3	2	3	1	2.67	229/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	3	2	4	2	3.25	186/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.25	

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 315  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1143/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1226/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1031/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1130/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	519/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	474/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1030/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1133/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	762/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1107/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	973/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	1110/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	894/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	150/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.09	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	152/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	201/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	129/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 15
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 12

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 316  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1143/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1226/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1031/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1130/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	519/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	474/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1030/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1257/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1163/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1312/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	150/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.09	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	109/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	152/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	201/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	129/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 15
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 1
					Other 12

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 317  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	1	3.00	1451/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	1462/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	2.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	4	0	2.60	1229/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	2.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	0	3	2	3.00	1361/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	0	4	1	2.78	1343/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	2.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	1248/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1343/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1434/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	2	0	2	2.88	1379/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	2.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1359/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	1	0	2	2.50	1381/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	0	2	2	2.88	1337/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	2.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	1176/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	1.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	194/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	224/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	179/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	232/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	194/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.13	

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	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZHU, GOUZHANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 318  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	1	3.00	1451/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	1462/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	2.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	4	0	2.60	1229/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	2.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	0	3	2	3.00	1361/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	0	4	1	2.78	1343/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	2.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	1248/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1343/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	3	1	1	2.75	1406/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1356/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	2.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1397/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1357/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1389/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	2.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	1.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	194/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	224/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	179/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	232/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	194/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.13	

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	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 319  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	6	4	0	3.00	1451/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	1	1	2.83	1450/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	4	0	2.92	1206/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	2.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	2	1	2.83	1393/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	1	5	0	2.90	1328/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	2.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1252/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	3	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	1	4	4	0	2.75	1406/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	2.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1122/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1358/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	2.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	0	5	2	1	2.82	1356/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	1294/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1125/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	2.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1199/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1241/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	231/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	6	0	3.30	221/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	202/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	3.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	6	2	1	0	0	1.44	240/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	1.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	201/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	2.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 319  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 320  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	6	4	0	3.00	1451/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	1	1	2.83	1450/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	4	0	2.92	1206/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	2.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	2	1	2.83	1393/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	2.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	1	5	0	2.90	1328/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	2.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1252/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	3	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	0	5	3	0	2.73	1411/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	2.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1404/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	2.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	2.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1146/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1199/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	2.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1241/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	231/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	6	0	3.30	221/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	202/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	3.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	6	2	1	0	0	1.44	240/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	1.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	201/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	2.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 320  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 321  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	967/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1296/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1179/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1207/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	985/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	755/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1236/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1013/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1168/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1002/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	953/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	860/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	122/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	103/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	193/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	156/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZEMEK, JOZEF (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 322  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	967/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1296/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1179/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1207/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	985/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	755/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1236/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	334/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	968/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	963/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1277/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1312/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	67/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	122/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	103/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	193/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	156/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 323  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1069/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	959/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	624/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	557/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	222/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1048/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	836/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	559/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	1184/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	376/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	421/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	549/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	895/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1084/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	26/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	40/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	94/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	189/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	25/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.88	

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	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: ZHU, GOUZHANG (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 324  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	1069/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	959/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	624/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	557/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	241/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	222/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1048/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1098/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1152/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1107/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	791/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	384/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	895/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1084/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	26/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	40/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	94/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	189/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	25/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.88	

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	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 325  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1069/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1118/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1017/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1087/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	649/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1046/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1019/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1205/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1002/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1116/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	989/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	931/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	87/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	145/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	152/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	4	3	2	0	2	2.36	234/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	115/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: CAI, HONGYI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 326  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1069/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1118/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1017/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1087/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	3	0	1	3	3.57	1042/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	649/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1154/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1189/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1232/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1296/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1130/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1297/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	931/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	87/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	145/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	152/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	4	3	2	0	2	2.36	234/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	115/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 327  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	0	3.38	1395/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1384/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1091/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1108/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1250/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1241/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1364/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	924/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	2.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1257/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	2.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1237/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1145/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	2.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	945/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1206/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	155/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	174/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	231/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	3.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	237/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	1.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	208/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	2.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 328  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	0	3.38	1395/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	4	1	3.25	1384/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1091/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1108/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1250/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1241/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1364/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	1329/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1406/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	2.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1405/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	2.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1397/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1399/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	2.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1206/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1167/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	155/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	174/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	231/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	3.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	237/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	1.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	1	1	0	2.60	208/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	2.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 329  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	2	3.67	1299/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1359/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1100/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1242/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	942/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1269/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1292/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	7	3	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1211/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1296/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	8	1	2	3.25	1294/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1253/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	860/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	197/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	161/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	152/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	1	5	3	0	2.82	222/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	155/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 12
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 352L 0112  
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB  
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 330  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	6	2	3.67	1299/1481	3.64	3.84	4.29	4.29	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	1	3.42	1359/1481	3.46	3.75	4.23	4.23	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1100/1249	3.54	3.62	4.27	4.28	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1242/1424	3.71	3.68	4.21	4.27	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	942/1396	3.64	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1269/1342	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.12	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1292/1459	3.47	3.86	4.16	4.17	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	4.99	4.94	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	5	4	0	3.20	1320/1450	3.51	3.65	4.09	4.10	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1344/1409	3.81	4.09	4.42	4.43	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1362/1407	3.89	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1303/1399	3.47	3.84	4.26	4.27	3.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1256/1400	3.42	3.69	4.27	4.28	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	3.23	3.53	3.96	4.02	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1262	3.37	3.46	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1259	3.11	3.65	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1256	2.97	3.62	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	4.00	3.47	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	197/ 246	4.01	4.04	4.20	4.20	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	161/ 249	3.96	4.01	4.11	4.23	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	152/ 242	4.19	4.34	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	1	5	3	0	2.82	222/ 240	2.85	3.84	4.20	3.96	2.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	155/ 217	3.67	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 12
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 401 0101  
 Title CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMICS  
 Instructor: GREGURICK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 331  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	0	2	5	4.38	708/1481	4.38	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1481	4.50	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1249	4.38	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	557/1424	4.40	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	839/1396	3.86	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	190/1342	4.67	3.67	4.07	4.21	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	196/1459	4.75	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1215/1480	4.25	4.94	4.68	4.74	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	692/1450	4.20	3.65	4.09	4.28	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1008/1407	4.63	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	947/1399	4.13	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	741/1400	4.38	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.53	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.46	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1259	4.00	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1256	4.33	3.62	4.30	4.60	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 431 0101  
 Title CHEMISTRY OF PROTEINS  
 Instructor: GARVIE, COLIN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 332  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	8	4.27	831/1481	4.27	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	6	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1056/1249	3.73	3.62	4.27	4.44	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	840/1424	4.17	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	3	2	0	3	0	2.38	1377/1396	2.38	3.74	3.98	4.09	2.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1071/1342	3.60	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	766/1459	4.27	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	861/1407	4.73	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	976/1399	4.07	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	704/1400	4.40	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	243/1179	4.54	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1074/1262	3.29	3.46	4.05	4.33	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1002/1259	3.86	3.65	4.29	4.57	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	3.62	4.30	4.60	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 435 0101  
 Title CPX CARBOHYDRATES  
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 333  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	6	4.63	439/1481	4.63	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1481	4.50	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	245/1249	4.75	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	364/1424	4.57	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	297/1396	4.50	3.74	3.98	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	303/1342	4.50	3.67	4.07	4.21	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	321/1459	4.63	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	3.65	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.21	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	491/1399	4.57	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.71	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.46	4.05	4.33	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	358/1259	4.75	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	3.62	4.30	4.60	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: LEASE, RICHARD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 334  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	4.36	718/1481	4.18	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	589/1481	3.98	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	460/1249	3.82	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	263/1424	4.40	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	459/1396	3.65	3.74	3.98	4.09	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	277/1342	4.22	3.67	4.07	4.21	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	413/1459	4.07	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1206/1450	3.82	3.65	4.09	4.28	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	762/1409	3.79	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	930/1407	4.19	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	883/1399	3.89	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	913/1400	3.63	3.69	4.27	4.38	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	464/1179	3.80	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1262	3.17	3.46	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1259	3.80	3.65	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1256	3.80	3.62	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	26/ 246	4.69	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 249	4.31	4.01	4.11	3.87	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	63/ 242	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.45	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 240	4.56	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	54/ 217	4.00	3.89	4.04	3.86	4.63	

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	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	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	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: BLOKLIN, ADRIAN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 335  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	7	4.36	718/1481	4.18	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	589/1481	3.98	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	460/1249	3.82	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	263/1424	4.40	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	459/1396	3.65	3.74	3.98	4.09	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	277/1342	4.22	3.67	4.07	4.21	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	413/1459	4.07	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	245/1450	3.82	3.65	4.09	4.28	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	891/1409	3.79	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1245/1407	4.19	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	376/1399	3.89	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1204/1400	3.63	3.69	4.27	4.38	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	590/1179	3.80	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1262	3.17	3.46	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1259	3.80	3.65	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1256	3.80	3.62	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	26/ 246	4.69	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 249	4.31	4.01	4.11	3.87	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	63/ 242	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.45	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 240	4.56	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	54/ 217	4.00	3.89	4.04	3.86	4.63	

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	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	8	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	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: LEASE, RICHARD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 336  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.18	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.98	3.75	4.23	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1183/1249	3.82	3.62	4.27	4.44	3.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	908/1424	4.40	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.65	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	884/1342	4.22	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1228/1459	4.07	3.86	4.16	4.25	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.74	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.82	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	6	3	0	3.10	1352/1409	3.79	4.09	4.42	4.51	3.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1184/1407	4.19	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	6	2	1	3.20	1303/1399	3.89	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	4	1	3.20	1291/1400	3.63	3.69	4.27	4.38	3.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1021/1179	3.80	3.53	3.96	4.07	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1108/1262	3.17	3.46	4.05	4.33	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1027/1259	3.80	3.65	4.29	4.57	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1025/1256	3.80	3.62	4.30	4.60	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	74/ 246	4.69	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	193/ 249	4.31	4.01	4.11	3.87	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	206/ 242	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.45	3.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	147/ 240	4.56	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	177/ 217	4.00	3.89	4.04	3.86	3.38	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	8	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 437L 0201  
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR  
 Instructor: BRIGGS, LATESE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 337  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	3	4.00	1069/1481	4.18	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.98	3.75	4.23	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1183/1249	3.82	3.62	4.27	4.44	3.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	908/1424	4.40	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1292/1396	3.65	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	884/1342	4.22	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1228/1459	4.07	3.86	4.16	4.25	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.95	4.94	4.68	4.74	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1258/1450	3.82	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1347/1409	3.79	4.09	4.42	4.51	3.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1381/1407	4.19	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1237/1399	3.89	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1230/1400	3.63	3.69	4.27	4.38	3.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1179	3.80	3.53	3.96	4.07	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1108/1262	3.17	3.46	4.05	4.33	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1027/1259	3.80	3.65	4.29	4.57	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1025/1256	3.80	3.62	4.30	4.60	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	74/ 246	4.69	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	193/ 249	4.31	4.01	4.11	3.87	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	206/ 242	4.31	4.34	4.40	4.45	3.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	147/ 240	4.56	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	177/ 217	4.00	3.89	4.04	3.86	3.38	

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 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	8	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 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: ~~CREIGHTON, DONA~~ (Instr. A) Wendy Houch-Olson  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 338  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	10	13	26	4.28	805/1481	4.28	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	9	24	14	3.98	1023/1481	3.98	3.75	4.23	4.32	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	5	9	19	16	3.94	953/1249	3.94	3.62	4.27	4.44	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	31	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	959/1424	4.00	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	3	8	15	12	9	3.34	1163/1396	3.34	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	33	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	956/1342	3.80	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	3	10	14	21	4.10	909/1459	4.10	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	49	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	2	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	****/1450	3.76	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	41	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	****/1409	4.53	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	44	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	****/1407	4.52	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	1	1	0	5	4	3.91	****/1399	4.16	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	****/1400	4.39	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	47	2	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1179	3.07	3.53	3.96	4.07	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	5	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: ~~CREIGHTON, DONA~~ (Instr. A) Wendy Houch-Olson  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 338  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 20		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 4	Under-grad 49 Non-major 53
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 41		
			? 5		

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 339  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	10	13	26	4.28	805/1481	4.28	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	9	24	14	3.98	1023/1481	3.98	3.75	4.23	4.32	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	5	9	19	16	3.94	953/1249	3.94	3.62	4.27	4.44	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	31	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	959/1424	4.00	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	3	8	15	12	9	3.34	1163/1396	3.34	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	33	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	956/1342	3.80	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	3	10	14	21	4.10	909/1459	4.10	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	49	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	2	15	18	8	3.68	1151/1450	3.76	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	15	33	4.69	529/1409	4.53	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	19	28	4.60	1038/1407	4.52	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	10	20	18	4.17	910/1399	4.16	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	1	15	29	4.46	647/1400	4.39	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	15	7	2	7	9	7	3.22	1008/1179	3.07	3.53	3.96	4.07	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	5	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 339  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	49	Non-major	53
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	41				
				?	5						

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: HOUCK-OLSON, WE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 340  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	1	10	13	26	4.28	805/1481	4.28	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	9	24	14	3.98	1023/1481	3.98	3.75	4.23	4.32	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	5	9	19	16	3.94	953/1249	3.94	3.62	4.27	4.44	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	31	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	959/1424	4.00	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	3	8	15	12	9	3.34	1163/1396	3.34	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	33	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	956/1342	3.80	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	3	10	14	21	4.10	909/1459	4.10	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	49	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	10	25	7	3.84	1022/1450	3.76	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	5	14	27	4.38	924/1409	4.53	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	5	17	26	4.44	1160/1407	4.52	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	9	16	21	4.15	929/1399	4.16	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	4	3	14	26	4.32	816/1400	4.39	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	19	8	4	5	6	6	2.93	1073/1179	3.07	3.53	3.96	4.07	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	****/1262	****	3.46	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	****/1259	****	3.65	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	****/1256	****	3.62	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	5	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.04	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.34	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	3.84	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101  
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM  
 Instructor: HOUCK-OLSON, WE (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 83  
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 340  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	49	Non-major	53
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	41				
				?	5						

Course-Section: CHEM 455 0101  
 Title INTRO BIOMEDICINAL CHE  
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH  
 Enrollment: 80  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 341  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	0	0	0	3	8	28	4.64	417/1481	4.64	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	10	25	4.58	434/1481	4.58	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	5	12	20	4.32	695/1249	4.32	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	14	1	1	3	7	12	4.17	840/1424	4.17	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	13	8	13	3.74	934/1396	3.74	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	21	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	527/1342	4.28	3.67	4.07	4.21	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	2	2	9	24	4.49	490/1459	4.49	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	9	29	4.76	871/1480	4.76	4.94	4.68	4.74	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	11	22	4.62	252/1450	4.62	3.65	4.09	4.28	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	5	33	4.87	246/1409	4.87	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	400/1407	4.92	4.21	4.69	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	311/1399	4.72	3.84	4.26	4.36	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	8	30	4.74	324/1400	4.74	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	17	1	0	3	2	16	4.45	299/1179	4.45	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	2	0	3	3	4	3.58	965/1262	3.58	3.46	4.05	4.33	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	836/1259	4.17	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	901/1256	4.00	3.62	4.30	4.60	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 6
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General	16
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 37
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 342  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1481	4.32	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.14	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	498/1249	4.54	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	896/1424	3.68	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	823/1396	3.72	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	905/1342	3.10	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	460/1459	4.11	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.86	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1160/1450	3.74	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	188/1409	3.55	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	3.82	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	883/1399	3.45	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	829/1400	3.15	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	487/1179	4.10	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	708/1262	3.75	3.46	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	821/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	3.83	3.62	4.30	4.60	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	2.50	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 246	4.35	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	125/ 249	3.79	4.01	4.11	3.87	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	94/ 242	4.81	4.34	4.40	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	161/ 240	4.33	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	86/ 217	3.52	3.89	4.04	3.86	4.38	

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 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	3	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 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: SEE, BEE KOON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 343  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1481	4.32	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.14	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	498/1249	4.54	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	896/1424	3.68	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	823/1396	3.72	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	905/1342	3.10	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	460/1459	4.11	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.86	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	836/1450	3.74	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1251/1409	3.55	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1362/1407	3.82	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1277/1399	3.45	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1400	3.15	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1179	4.10	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	708/1262	3.75	3.46	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	821/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	3.83	3.62	4.30	4.60	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	2.50	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 246	4.35	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	125/ 249	3.79	4.01	4.11	3.87	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	94/ 242	4.81	4.34	4.40	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	161/ 240	4.33	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	86/ 217	3.52	3.89	4.04	3.86	4.38	

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 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	3	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 461 0101  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: SUN, JIAN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 344  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1481	4.32	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1000/1481	4.14	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	498/1249	4.54	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	896/1424	3.68	3.68	4.21	4.35	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	823/1396	3.72	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	905/1342	3.10	3.67	4.07	4.21	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	460/1459	4.11	3.86	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.86	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	836/1450	3.74	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1152/1409	3.55	4.09	4.42	4.51	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1362/1407	3.82	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1277/1399	3.45	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1400	3.15	3.69	4.27	4.38	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1179	4.10	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	708/1262	3.75	3.46	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	821/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	901/1256	3.83	3.62	4.30	4.60	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	2.50	3.47	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 246	4.35	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	125/ 249	3.79	4.01	4.11	3.87	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	94/ 242	4.81	4.34	4.40	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	161/ 240	4.33	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	86/ 217	3.52	3.89	4.04	3.86	4.38	

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 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	3	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 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 345  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4.14	967/1481	4.32	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	790/1481	4.14	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	432/1249	4.54	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1333/1424	3.68	3.68	4.21	4.35	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.72	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1335/1342	3.10	3.67	4.07	4.21	2.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1177/1459	4.11	3.86	4.16	4.25	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	912/1480	4.86	4.94	4.68	4.74	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	836/1450	3.74	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	3.55	4.09	4.42	4.51	2.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	899/1407	3.82	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	929/1399	3.45	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	844/1400	3.15	3.69	4.27	4.38	2.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	590/1179	4.10	3.53	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	995/1262	3.75	3.46	4.05	4.33	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	895/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1069/1256	3.83	3.62	4.30	4.60	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	3.47	4.00	4.26	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	116/ 246	4.35	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	216/ 249	3.79	4.01	4.11	3.87	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.34	4.40	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 240	4.33	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	206/ 217	3.52	3.89	4.04	3.86	2.67	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: SEE, BEE KOON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 346  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4.14	967/1481	4.32	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	790/1481	4.14	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	432/1249	4.54	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1333/1424	3.68	3.68	4.21	4.35	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.72	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1335/1342	3.10	3.67	4.07	4.21	2.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1177/1459	4.11	3.86	4.16	4.25	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	912/1480	4.86	4.94	4.68	4.74	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1098/1450	3.74	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1395/1409	3.55	4.09	4.42	4.51	2.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1354/1407	3.82	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1277/1399	3.45	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1364/1400	3.15	3.69	4.27	4.38	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	995/1262	3.75	3.46	4.05	4.33	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	895/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1069/1256	3.83	3.62	4.30	4.60	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	3.47	4.00	4.26	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	116/ 246	4.35	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	216/ 249	3.79	4.01	4.11	3.87	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.34	4.40	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 240	4.33	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	206/ 217	3.52	3.89	4.04	3.86	2.67	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102  
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO  
 Instructor: SUN, JIAN (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 347  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	2	3	4.14	967/1481	4.32	3.84	4.29	4.45	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	790/1481	4.14	3.75	4.23	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	432/1249	4.54	3.62	4.27	4.44	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1333/1424	3.68	3.68	4.21	4.35	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1042/1396	3.72	3.74	3.98	4.09	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1335/1342	3.10	3.67	4.07	4.21	2.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1177/1459	4.11	3.86	4.16	4.25	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	912/1480	4.86	4.94	4.68	4.74	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.74	3.65	4.09	4.28	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1406/1409	3.55	4.09	4.42	4.51	2.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1402/1407	3.82	4.21	4.69	4.79	3.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1392/1399	3.45	3.84	4.26	4.36	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1398/1400	3.15	3.69	4.27	4.38	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	995/1262	3.75	3.46	4.05	4.33	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	895/1259	4.10	3.65	4.29	4.57	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1069/1256	3.83	3.62	4.30	4.60	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	763/ 788	2.50	3.47	4.00	4.26	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	116/ 246	4.35	4.04	4.20	4.45	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	216/ 249	3.79	4.01	4.11	3.87	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 242	4.81	4.34	4.40	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	82/ 240	4.33	3.84	4.20	4.43	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	206/ 217	3.52	3.89	4.04	3.86	2.67	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 601 0101  
 Title CURRENT TOPICS IN CHEM  
 Instructor: SUMMERS, MICHAEL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 348  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	3.84	4.29	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	693/1481	4.38	3.75	4.23	4.11	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	498/1249	4.50	3.62	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	3.68	4.21	4.16	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	950/1396	3.71	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	649/1342	4.14	3.67	4.07	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.86	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	334/1450	3.17	3.65	4.09	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	231/1409	4.51	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.29	4.21	4.69	4.73	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	267/1399	3.25	3.84	4.26	4.16	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1400	3.25	3.69	4.27	4.17	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1041/1179	3.50	3.53	3.96	3.81	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.46	4.05	4.07	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	3.65	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	680/1256	4.40	3.62	4.30	4.33	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 601 0101  
 Title CURRENT TOPICS IN CHEM  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 349  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	3.84	4.29	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	693/1481	4.38	3.75	4.23	4.11	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	498/1249	4.50	3.62	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	3.68	4.21	4.16	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	950/1396	3.71	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	649/1342	4.14	3.67	4.07	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.86	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1437/1450	3.17	3.65	4.09	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	968/1409	4.51	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1296/1407	4.29	4.21	4.69	4.73	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1381/1399	3.25	3.84	4.26	4.16	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1364/1400	3.25	3.69	4.27	4.17	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	590/1179	3.50	3.53	3.96	3.81	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.46	4.05	4.07	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	3.65	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	680/1256	4.40	3.62	4.30	4.33	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: CHEM 601 0101  
 Title CURRENT TOPICS IN CHEM  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 350  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	4	4.50	549/1481	4.50	3.84	4.29	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	693/1481	4.38	3.75	4.23	4.11	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	498/1249	4.50	3.62	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1333/1424	3.25	3.68	4.21	4.16	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	950/1396	3.71	3.74	3.98	4.00	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	649/1342	4.14	3.67	4.07	4.18	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.86	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.94	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1417/1450	3.17	3.65	4.09	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	968/1409	4.51	4.09	4.42	4.36	4.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1296/1407	4.29	4.21	4.69	4.73	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1381/1399	3.25	3.84	4.26	4.16	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1364/1400	3.25	3.69	4.27	4.17	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.53	3.96	3.81	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	507/1262	4.33	3.46	4.05	4.07	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	3.65	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	680/1256	4.40	3.62	4.30	4.33	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.47	4.00	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.01	4.11	3.93	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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