

Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101
 Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD
 Instructor: PRADOS, ANA
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 201
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	1094/1522	4.05	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	874/1522	4.25	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	478/1285	4.55	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	12	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1198/1476	3.75	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	475/1412	4.35	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	11	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	743/1381	4.11	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	731/1500	4.30	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	11	3	3.89	1041/1497	3.89	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	353/1440	4.80	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	629/1448	4.85	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	720/1436	4.40	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	579/1432	4.55	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	187/1221	4.65	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	988/1280	3.60	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	988/1277	3.93	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	777/1269	4.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	737/ 854	3.29	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101
 Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD
 Instructor: PRADOS, ANA
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 201
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 202
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	11	17	21	4.08	1074/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	13	18	18	3.98	1102/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	10	22	17	4.02	932/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	4	10	11	7	3.66	1251/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	3	10	9	20	4.10	703/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	3	2	4	9	4	3.41	1198/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	6	19	22	4.18	860/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	9	40	4.75	820/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	1	7	21	14	4.05	872/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	4	42	4.69	578/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	6	42	4.76	840/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	7	13	30	4.41	708/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	11	32	4.43	720/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	3	5	14	23	4.27	455/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	10	18	16	3.80	874/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	6	10	31	4.32	751/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	4	8	18	16	3.76	1024/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	6	6	12	19	3.65	630/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 2	A 9	Required for Majors	6
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 11	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	35

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 203
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	11	17	21	4.08	1074/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	13	18	18	3.98	1102/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	10	22	17	4.02	932/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	4	10	11	7	3.66	1251/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	3	10	9	20	4.10	703/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	3	2	4	9	4	3.41	1198/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	6	19	22	4.18	860/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	9	40	4.75	820/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	8	5	2	7	4	2	2.80	1450/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	39	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1118/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	****/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	43	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	****/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	****/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	41	1	0	2	0	5	3	3.90	****/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	10	18	16	3.80	874/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	6	10	31	4.32	751/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	4	8	18	16	3.76	1024/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	6	6	12	19	3.65	630/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 2	A 9	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 11	General 1	Under-grad 52 Non-major 52
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 35	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 204
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	11	17	21	4.08	1074/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	13	18	18	3.98	1102/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	10	22	17	4.02	932/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	4	10	11	7	3.66	1251/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	3	10	9	20	4.10	703/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	3	2	4	9	4	3.41	1198/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	6	19	22	4.18	860/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	9	40	4.75	820/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	0	12	16	3	3.71	1181/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	42	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	38	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1097/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	41	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	****/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	****/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	2	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	****/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	10	18	16	3.80	874/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	6	10	31	4.32	751/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	4	8	18	16	3.76	1024/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	6	6	12	19	3.65	630/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 2	A 9	Required for Majors	6
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 18	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 11	Under-grad	52
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0	Non-major	52
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	35
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 205
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	11	17	21	4.08	1074/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	13	18	18	3.98	1102/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	10	22	17	4.02	932/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	4	10	11	7	3.66	1251/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	3	10	9	20	4.10	703/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	28	3	2	4	9	4	3.41	1198/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	6	19	22	4.18	860/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	9	40	4.75	820/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	3	1	0	11	13	4	3.66	1210/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	42	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	38	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1024/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	41	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	****/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	****/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	39	2	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	****/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	10	18	16	3.80	874/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	6	10	31	4.32	751/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	4	4	8	18	16	3.76	1024/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	6	6	12	19	3.65	630/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	50	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 2	A 9	Required for Majors	6
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 11	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	35

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 206
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	16	20	16	3.87	1234/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	16	21	18	4.00	1080/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	9	20	22	4.07	898/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	5	14	10	12	3.64	1257/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	15	13	16	3.72	1037/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	21	2	4	8	8	10	3.63	1119/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	2	16	14	19	3.92	1068/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	4	0	0	0	17	31	4.65	952/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	0	9	16	16	4.17	744/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	11	40	4.60	682/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	8	42	4.69	977/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	6	4	15	28	4.23	906/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	8	7	33	4.25	892/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	3	12	10	25	4.08	582/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	16	12	3.50	1031/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	6	2	11	10	23	3.81	1050/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	5	14	17	12	3.59	1101/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	7	10	7	18	3.67	625/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 206
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 207
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	16	20	16	3.87	1234/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	16	21	18	4.00	1080/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	9	20	22	4.07	898/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	5	14	10	12	3.64	1257/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	15	13	16	3.72	1037/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	21	2	4	8	8	10	3.63	1119/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	2	16	14	19	3.92	1068/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	4	0	0	0	17	31	4.65	952/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	1	3	15	13	5	3.49	1286/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	2	1	4	11	16	4.12	1142/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	1	3	6	24	4.46	1199/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	3	7	10	8	3.72	1221/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	3	3	5	8	10	3.66	1227/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	1	2	9	8	8	3.71	808/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	16	12	3.50	1031/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	6	2	11	10	23	3.81	1050/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	5	14	17	12	3.59	1101/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	7	10	7	18	3.67	625/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 207
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 208
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	16	20	16	3.87	1234/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	16	21	18	4.00	1080/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	9	20	22	4.07	898/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	5	14	10	12	3.64	1257/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	15	13	16	3.72	1037/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	21	2	4	8	8	10	3.63	1119/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	2	16	14	19	3.92	1068/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	4	0	0	0	17	31	4.65	952/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	4	0	4	18	11	5	3.45	1305/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	3	1	8	7	13	3.81	1283/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	3	6	7	17	4.15	1329/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	1	8	10	8	3.82	1189/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	5	6	7	7	3.44	1291/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	4	2	2	7	7	4	3.41	956/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	16	12	3.50	1031/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	6	2	11	10	23	3.81	1050/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	5	14	17	12	3.59	1101/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	7	10	7	18	3.67	625/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 208
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 209
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	16	20	16	3.87	1234/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	16	21	18	4.00	1080/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	9	20	22	4.07	898/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	5	14	10	12	3.64	1257/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	15	13	16	3.72	1037/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	21	2	4	8	8	10	3.63	1119/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	2	16	14	19	3.92	1068/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	4	0	0	0	17	31	4.65	952/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	4	0	1	14	15	8	3.79	1126/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	2	0	7	8	15	4.06	1163/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	4	8	21	4.52	1148/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	1	5	11	11	4.14	972/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	1	3	8	4	10	3.73	1199/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	4	2	1	6	7	5	3.57	871/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	6	14	16	12	3.50	1031/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	6	2	11	10	23	3.81	1050/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	5	14	17	12	3.59	1101/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	3	7	10	7	18	3.67	625/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 209
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 210
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	10	19	16	3.88	1229/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	11	21	15	3.94	1146/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	7	18	19	4.02	926/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	3	4	4	13	9	3.64	1263/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	7	6	16	18	3.90	900/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	3	2	7	9	5	3.42	1188/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	8	5	14	19	3.78	1168/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	40	4.80	714/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	12	19	6	3.76	1140/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	17	29	4.53	763/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	7	38	4.69	965/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	7	19	20	4.14	972/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	8	10	25	4.17	942/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	3	4	12	22	4.14	548/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	7	19	19	4.08	690/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	2	7	9	29	4.24	812/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	1	7	18	17	3.85	981/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	3	6	11	23	4.04	420/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.04	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 210
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	50
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 211
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	10	19	16	3.88	1229/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	11	21	15	3.94	1146/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	7	18	19	4.02	926/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	3	4	4	13	9	3.64	1263/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	7	6	16	18	3.90	900/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	3	2	7	9	5	3.42	1188/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	8	5	14	19	3.78	1168/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	40	4.80	714/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	2	1	15	16	1	3.37	1334/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	917/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	1	1	9	17	4.50	1157/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	3	3	14	7	3.93	1137/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	1	5	8	12	4.07	1004/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	1	0	4	10	12	4.19	508/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	7	19	19	4.08	690/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	2	7	9	29	4.24	812/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	1	7	18	17	3.85	981/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	3	6	11	23	4.04	420/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.04	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 211
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	50
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 212
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	10	19	16	3.88	1229/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	11	21	15	3.94	1146/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	4	7	18	19	4.02	926/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	3	4	4	13	9	3.64	1263/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	7	6	16	18	3.90	900/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	3	2	7	9	5	3.42	1188/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	8	5	14	19	3.78	1168/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	40	4.80	714/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	0	8	23	3	3.85	1073/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	798/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	0	1	13	14	4.34	1266/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	1	5	13	8	4.04	1040/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	2	4	9	10	4.08	1000/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	524/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	7	19	19	4.08	690/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	2	7	9	29	4.24	812/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	1	7	18	17	3.85	981/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	3	6	11	23	4.04	420/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.04	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 212
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	50
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 213
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	10	19	16	3.88	1229/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	11	21	15	3.94	1146/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	7	18	19	4.02	926/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	3	4	4	13	9	3.64	1263/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	7	6	16	18	3.90	900/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	3	2	7	9	5	3.42	1188/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	8	5	14	19	3.78	1168/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	40	4.80	714/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	1	9	21	3	3.76	1140/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	2	10	15	4.48	824/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	13	16	4.50	1157/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	1	5	14	8	4.04	1040/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	1	4	9	10	4.04	1018/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	4	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	524/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	7	19	19	4.08	690/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	2	7	9	29	4.24	812/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	1	7	18	17	3.85	981/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	3	6	11	23	4.04	420/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.04	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 213
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	1	Under-grad	50	Non-major	50
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 214
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	7	9	9	3.52	1398/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	9	8	3.50	1365/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	5	7	12	3.77	1083/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1275/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	7	7	9	3.74	1021/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1260/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	8	4	11	3.48	1309/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	1	7	21	4.57	1028/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	3	5	13	4	3.72	1167/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	8	16	4.19	1094/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	1123/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	7	9	9	3.67	1241/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	2	9	13	3.97	1072/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	1	5	6	10	3.76	781/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	8	7	3.41	1076/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	7	8	9	3.66	1097/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	10	6	6	3.21	1187/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	4	3	3	3	10	3.52	668/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.52	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 31	Non-major 31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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 20		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 215
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	7	9	9	3.52	1398/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	9	8	3.50	1365/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	5	7	12	3.77	1083/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1275/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	7	7	9	3.74	1021/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1260/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	8	4	11	3.48	1309/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	1	7	21	4.57	1028/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	1	8	10	1	3.32	1352/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	0	6	7	7	3.90	1252/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	1	7	14	4.43	1215/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	6	4	7	3.65	1244/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	1	3	6	6	3.33	1320/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	585/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	8	7	3.41	1076/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	7	8	9	3.66	1097/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	10	6	6	3.21	1187/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	4	3	3	3	10	3.52	668/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.52	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 31 Non-major 31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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 20	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 216
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	7	9	9	3.52	1398/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	9	8	3.50	1365/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	5	7	12	3.77	1083/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1275/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	7	7	9	3.74	1021/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1260/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	8	4	11	3.48	1309/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	1	7	21	4.57	1028/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	4	2	3	5	6	2	3.17	1395/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1273/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1402/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1181/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1224/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	707/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	8	7	3.41	1076/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	7	8	9	3.66	1097/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	10	6	6	3.21	1187/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	4	3	3	3	10	3.52	668/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.52	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 31 Non-major 31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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 20	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 217
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	7	9	9	3.52	1398/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	9	8	3.50	1365/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	5	7	12	3.77	1083/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1275/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	7	7	9	3.74	1021/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	2	3	4	1	3.18	1260/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	8	4	11	3.48	1309/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	1	7	21	4.57	1028/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	5	9	8	4.04	872/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1167/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1207/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1029/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	984/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	5	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	695/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	8	7	3.41	1076/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	3	7	8	9	3.66	1097/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	10	6	6	3.21	1187/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	4	3	3	3	10	3.52	668/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.52	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 31 Non-major 31
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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 20	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 218
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	6	3	16	14	14	3.51	1402/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	14	21	14	3.83	1227/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	3	11	20	15	3.90	1027/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	1	7	10	13	8	3.51	1319/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.51	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	5	9	14	16	3.69	1065/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	2	8	12	8	5	3.17	1263/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	6	15	21	3.83	1135/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	2	1	13	32	4.49	1096/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	1	1	10	15	7	3.76	1140/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	7	9	31	4.46	864/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	3	3	9	35	4.52	1140/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	3	12	13	19	4.02	1045/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	3	4	4	5	13	22	3.94	1099/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	5	2	11	8	20	3.78	770/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	13	4	8	10	13	3.13	1172/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	9	26	4.27	796/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	5	13	12	12	3.50	1117/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	11	3	5	5	19	3.42	701/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 218
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 219
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	6	3	16	14	14	3.51	1402/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	14	21	14	3.83	1227/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	3	11	20	15	3.90	1027/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	1	7	10	13	8	3.51	1319/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.51	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	5	9	14	16	3.69	1065/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	2	8	12	8	5	3.17	1263/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	6	15	21	3.83	1135/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	2	1	13	32	4.49	1096/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	1	0	5	12	10	1	3.25	1370/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	4	6	13	12	3.94	1225/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	2	5	7	23	4.38	1253/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	8	7	8	7	3.31	1340/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	5	5	7	5	7	3.14	1351/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	1	4	1	13	4	9	3.42	950/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	13	4	8	10	13	3.13	1172/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	9	26	4.27	796/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	5	13	12	12	3.50	1117/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	11	3	5	5	19	3.42	701/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 219
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 220
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	6	3	16	14	14	3.51	1402/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	14	21	14	3.83	1227/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	3	11	20	15	3.90	1027/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	1	7	10	13	8	3.51	1319/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.51	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	5	9	14	16	3.69	1065/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	2	8	12	8	5	3.17	1263/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	6	15	21	3.83	1135/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	2	1	13	32	4.49	1096/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	0	0	2	9	16	2	3.62	1227/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	3	7	9	10	3.90	1255/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	4	4	10	14	4.06	1346/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	1	1	11	9	7	3.69	1234/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	1	5	5	8	7	3.58	1251/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	3	3	2	9	3	8	3.44	933/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	13	4	8	10	13	3.13	1172/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	9	26	4.27	796/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	5	13	12	12	3.50	1117/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	11	3	5	5	19	3.42	701/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 220
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER, J (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 221
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	6	3	16	14	14	3.51	1402/1522	3.77	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	14	21	14	3.83	1227/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	3	11	20	15	3.90	1027/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	12	1	7	10	13	8	3.51	1319/1476	3.61	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.51	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	5	9	14	16	3.69	1065/1412	3.83	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	2	8	12	8	5	3.17	1263/1381	3.36	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	4	6	6	15	21	3.83	1135/1500	3.84	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	2	1	13	32	4.49	1096/1517	4.65	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.49	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	0	0	2	8	15	4	3.72	1167/1497	3.62	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	2	7	9	10	3.86	1266/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	5	3	10	14	4.03	1349/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	1	4	11	7	7	3.50	1282/1436	3.89	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	1	3	3	6	7	7	3.46	1284/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	3	4	2	9	3	8	3.35	979/1221	3.84	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	13	4	8	10	13	3.13	1172/1280	3.58	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	7	9	26	4.27	796/1277	4.06	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	5	13	12	12	3.50	1117/1269	3.58	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	11	3	5	5	19	3.42	701/ 854	3.66	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	2	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	51	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	51	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	51	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER, J (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 221
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	55	Non-major	55
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 222
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	11	9	3.90	1220/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	9	12	5	3.59	1331/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	7	9	6	3.45	1185/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	3	6	1	4	3.13	1406/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	7	5	14	4.19	629/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	1248/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	8	5	10	3.64	1244/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	1	0	0	23	4.88	555/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	1	5	9	6	3	3.21	1386/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	6	7	11	3.82	1280/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	6	6	15	4.21	1313/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	12	5	6	3.39	1317/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	5	5	6	5	3.04	1361/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	4	3	5	5	6	3.26	1008/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	12	7	3.72	927/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	8	14	4.14	885/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	8	9	8	3.66	1078/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.66	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	1	3	8	13	3.86	542/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
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 22	
			? 4		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 223
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	11	9	3.90	1220/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	9	12	5	3.59	1331/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	7	9	6	3.45	1185/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	3	6	1	4	3.13	1406/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	7	5	14	4.19	629/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	1248/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	8	5	10	3.64	1244/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	1	0	0	23	4.88	555/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	9	3	0	2	5	1	3.09	1410/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	1385/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1419/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1400/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	2	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	1	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	****/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	12	7	3.72	927/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	8	14	4.14	885/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	8	9	8	3.66	1078/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.66	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	1	3	8	13	3.86	542/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
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 22	
			? 4		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: LONGENBERGE, J (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 224
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	11	9	3.90	1220/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	9	12	5	3.59	1331/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	7	9	6	3.45	1185/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	3	6	1	4	3.13	1406/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	7	5	14	4.19	629/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	1248/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	8	5	10	3.64	1244/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	1	0	0	23	4.88	555/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	506/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	798/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1089/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1203/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	556/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	12	7	3.72	927/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	8	14	4.14	885/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	8	9	8	3.66	1078/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.66	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	1	3	8	13	3.86	542/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
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 22	
			? 4		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 225
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	11	9	3.90	1220/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	9	12	5	3.59	1331/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	7	9	6	3.45	1185/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	3	6	1	4	3.13	1406/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	7	5	14	4.19	629/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	20	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	1248/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	8	5	10	3.64	1244/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	1	0	0	23	4.88	555/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	3	7	5	3	3.20	1386/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	1359/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1405/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.01	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	3	4	1	2	3.00	1378/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	2	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1384/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	****/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	12	7	3.72	927/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	5	8	14	4.14	885/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	2	8	9	8	3.66	1078/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.66	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	4	1	3	8	13	3.86	542/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 30 Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
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 22	
			? 4		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 226
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	8	7	19	22	5	3.15	1477/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	23	17	6	3.10	1473/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	12	15	13	11	3.08	1241/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	32	6	2	12	6	2	2.86	1438/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	6	6	13	13	18	3.55	1138/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	5	3	8	6	2	2.88	1320/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	9	5	18	20	6	3.16	1413/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	1	0	1	17	35	4.57	1019/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	3	8	20	11	1	2.98	1424/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	14	15	24	3.90	1252/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	9	17	29	4.13	1334/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	8	17	15	15	3.49	1285/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	12	9	13	9	14	3.07	1357/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	7	3	17	11	16	3.48	910/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	7	11	16	17	3.46	1056/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	3	11	16	25	3.93	988/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	18	16	18	3.68	1070/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	6	5	12	9	20	3.62	647/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 24	General 1	Under-grad 61	Non-major 60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 44		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 227
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	8	7	19	22	5	3.15	1477/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	23	17	6	3.10	1473/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	12	15	13	11	3.08	1241/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	32	6	2	12	6	2	2.86	1438/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	6	6	13	13	18	3.55	1138/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	5	3	8	6	2	2.88	1320/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	9	5	18	20	6	3.16	1413/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	1	0	1	17	35	4.57	1019/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	2	19	15	3	3.42	1315/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	1	9	10	16	4.14	1130/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	1	6	11	19	4.30	1287/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	3	11	11	8	3.65	1247/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	5	2	10	10	5	3.25	1335/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	4	0	3	12	5	9	3.69	823/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	7	11	16	17	3.46	1056/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	3	11	16	25	3.93	988/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	18	16	18	3.68	1070/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	6	5	12	9	20	3.62	647/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 24	General 1	Under-grad 61	Non-major 60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 44		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 228
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	8	7	19	22	5	3.15	1477/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	23	17	6	3.10	1473/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	12	15	13	11	3.08	1241/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	32	6	2	12	6	2	2.86	1438/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	6	6	13	13	18	3.55	1138/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	5	3	8	6	2	2.88	1320/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	9	5	18	20	6	3.16	1413/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	1	0	1	17	35	4.57	1019/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	0	8	17	14	4.07	852/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	1	9	11	11	4.00	1186/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	5	16	14	4.26	1300/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	4	9	9	9	3.74	1215/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	3	9	8	7	3.52	1267/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	8	0	4	10	2	6	3.45	927/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	7	11	16	17	3.46	1056/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	3	11	16	25	3.93	988/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	18	16	18	3.68	1070/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	6	5	12	9	20	3.62	647/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 24	General 1	Under-grad 61	Non-major 60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 44		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: LONGENBERGER, J (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 229
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	8	7	19	22	5	3.15	1477/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	23	17	6	3.10	1473/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	12	15	13	11	3.08	1241/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	32	6	2	12	6	2	2.86	1438/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	6	6	13	13	18	3.55	1138/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	5	3	8	6	2	2.88	1320/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	9	5	18	20	6	3.16	1413/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	1	0	1	17	35	4.57	1019/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	0	5	19	15	4.18	744/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	1	7	13	11	4.06	1163/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	5	15	15	4.29	1290/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	3	9	9	10	3.84	1185/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	3	7	9	8	3.62	1236/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	9	0	3	10	3	6	3.55	883/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	7	11	16	17	3.46	1056/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	3	11	16	25	3.93	988/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	5	2	18	16	18	3.68	1070/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	6	5	12	9	20	3.62	647/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.62	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 9			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 24	General 1	Under-grad 61	Non-major 60
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 44		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 230
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	11	14	6	3.70	1325/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	18	2	3.52	1360/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	8	6	10	8	3.48	1168/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	3	3	9	3	1	2.79	1445/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	5	9	11	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1283/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	11	7	7	3.38	1366/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	23	4.65	952/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	3	2	13	5	1	2.96	1428/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	6	13	10	3.79	1294/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	7	4	19	4.18	1322/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	4	10	8	7	3.30	1343/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	8	3	7	4	8	3.03	1361/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	6	1	7	7	8	3.34	979/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	7	10	8	3.60	988/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	6	7	15	4.17	867/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	3	7	10	9	3.86	976/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	3	1	5	5	13	3.89	533/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 230
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 231
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	11	14	6	3.70	1325/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	18	2	3.52	1360/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	8	6	10	8	3.48	1168/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	3	3	9	3	1	2.79	1445/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	5	9	11	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1283/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	11	7	7	3.38	1366/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	23	4.65	952/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	3	8	7	2	3.29	1361/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	2	2	3	6	7	3.70	1322/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	4	2	14	4.38	1249/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	5	6	8	4.00	1056/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	1	2	4	8	4	3.63	1233/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	2	2	1	6	5	3.63	850/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	7	10	8	3.60	988/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	6	7	15	4.17	867/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	3	7	10	9	3.86	976/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	3	1	5	5	13	3.89	533/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 231
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: LONGENBERGE, J (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 232
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	11	14	6	3.70	1325/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	18	2	3.52	1360/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	8	6	10	8	3.48	1168/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	3	3	9	3	1	2.79	1445/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	5	9	11	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1283/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	11	7	7	3.38	1366/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	23	4.65	952/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	525/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	2	1	4	6	6	3.68	1326/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	1262/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	835/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	942/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	6	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	319/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	7	10	8	3.60	988/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	6	7	15	4.17	867/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	3	7	10	9	3.86	976/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	3	1	5	5	13	3.89	533/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: LONGENBERGE, J (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 232
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 233
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	11	14	6	3.70	1325/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	18	2	3.52	1360/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	8	6	10	8	3.48	1168/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	3	3	9	3	1	2.79	1445/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	5	9	11	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1283/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	11	7	7	3.38	1366/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	1	6	23	4.65	952/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	10	7	4	3.64	1221/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	2	1	4	7	5	3.63	1338/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	1319/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1189/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1013/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	6	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	319/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	7	10	8	3.60	988/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	6	7	15	4.17	867/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	3	7	10	9	3.86	976/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	3	1	5	5	13	3.89	533/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 233
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 234
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	10	13	23	17	3.62	1356/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	6	10	18	24	7	3.25	1445/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	13	6	11	22	14	3.27	1220/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	33	6	3	5	13	7	3.35	1359/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	4	6	19	23	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	39	5	1	9	7	4	3.15	1268/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	7	6	17	19	15	3.45	1327/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	8	0	0	1	6	51	4.86	577/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	5	7	8	18	7	5	2.89	1440/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	5	21	12	24	3.71	1318/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	8	19	36	4.33	1271/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	7	11	17	16	15	3.32	1340/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	11	13	10	11	9	13	2.98	1367/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	8	12	19	14	13	3.18	1033/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	3	12	18	22	3.77	894/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	10	11	36	4.26	796/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	2	13	21	19	3.74	1041/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	3	3	11	17	24	3.97	465/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.97	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	63	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	63	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	63	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	14
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	22
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	12	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	3
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	3	Under-grad
			Electives	0	68
			Other	48	Non-major
					65
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 237
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	12	24	13	3.88	1229/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	9	12	21	7	3.38	1408/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	5	14	14	15	3.65	1129/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	1	4	6	12	3	3.46	1334/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	10	16	16	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1058/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	19	11	13	3.53	1290/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	5	0	0	0	4	42	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	5	4	14	17	1	3.12	1405/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	5	10	13	20	3.77	1301/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	0	7	18	24	4.22	1313/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	10	4	7	16	12	3.33	1337/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	8	6	4	10	9	14	3.49	1277/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	4	13	11	17	3.67	827/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	8	14	26	4.24	598/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	6	11	31	4.38	706/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	4	11	14	17	3.72	1047/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	8	11	24	4.24	336/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 237
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 238
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	12	24	13	3.88	1229/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	9	12	21	7	3.38	1408/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	5	14	14	15	3.65	1129/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	1	4	6	12	3	3.46	1334/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	10	16	16	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1058/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	19	11	13	3.53	1290/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	5	0	0	0	4	42	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	2	6	23	7	3.85	1081/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	2	2	5	9	19	4.11	1148/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	0	2	15	21	4.41	1232/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	0	5	14	15	4.11	995/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	2	5	14	12	4.00	1036/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	2	0	11	10	9	3.75	786/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	8	14	26	4.24	598/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	6	11	31	4.38	706/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	4	11	14	17	3.72	1047/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	8	11	24	4.24	336/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 238
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 239
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	12	24	13	3.88	1229/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	9	12	21	7	3.38	1408/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	5	14	14	15	3.65	1129/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	1	4	6	12	3	3.46	1334/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	10	16	16	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1058/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	19	11	13	3.53	1290/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	5	0	0	0	4	42	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	0	4	23	11	4.18	731/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	2	4	8	19	4.33	984/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	5	12	19	4.32	1275/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	1	3	11	16	4.35	772/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	2	5	12	11	4.07	1009/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	4	2	0	11	7	6	3.58	871/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	8	14	26	4.24	598/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	6	11	31	4.38	706/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	4	11	14	17	3.72	1047/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	8	11	24	4.24	336/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 239
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 240
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	12	24	13	3.88	1229/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	9	12	21	7	3.38	1408/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	5	14	14	15	3.65	1129/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	1	4	6	12	3	3.46	1334/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	10	16	16	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1058/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	6	19	11	13	3.53	1290/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	5	0	0	0	4	42	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	5	3	13	14	3	3.18	1390/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	2	6	10	14	4.03	1174/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	3	0	6	13	15	4.00	1353/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	4	1	6	12	9	3.66	1244/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	2	6	14	7	3.80	1170/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	4	3	1	10	7	5	3.38	963/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	8	14	26	4.24	598/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	6	11	31	4.38	706/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	4	11	14	17	3.72	1047/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	1	8	11	24	4.24	336/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 240
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 241
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	9	10	17	12	3.37	1445/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	5	17	19	5	3.15	1467/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	6	10	19	10	3.28	1220/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	7	9	9	5	4	2.71	1454/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	11	11	22	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	8	3	8	6	4	2.83	1328/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	9	14	17	10	3.42	1351/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	6	2	1	2	5	38	4.58	1011/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	5	6	7	18	6	1	2.71	1464/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	9	6	8	14	16	3.42	1373/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	5	2	9	14	22	3.88	1387/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	8	6	19	11	9	3.13	1368/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	9	15	6	7	6	9	2.72	1390/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	7	7	8	12	11	3.29	1001/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	4	12	12	15	3.43	1066/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	10	16	19	3.90	1013/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	5	10	15	16	3.63	1089/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	5	4	11	8	19	3.68	616/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.68	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 12	General 1	Under-grad 55 Non-major 53
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 30	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 242
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	9	10	17	12	3.37	1445/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	5	17	19	5	3.15	1467/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	6	10	19	10	3.28	1220/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	7	9	9	5	4	2.71	1454/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	11	11	22	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	8	3	8	6	4	2.83	1328/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	9	14	17	10	3.42	1351/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	6	2	1	2	5	38	4.58	1011/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	2	4	17	14	1	3.21	1382/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	2	7	14	16	4.05	1167/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	1	5	10	23	4.32	1275/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	16	11	12	3.83	1189/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	7	9	10	10	3.38	1311/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	9	2	4	9	6	9	3.53	887/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	4	12	12	15	3.43	1066/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	10	16	19	3.90	1013/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	5	10	15	16	3.63	1089/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	5	4	11	8	19	3.68	616/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.68	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	4
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 12	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 55
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 243
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	9	10	17	12	3.37	1445/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	5	17	19	5	3.15	1467/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	6	10	19	10	3.28	1220/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	7	9	9	5	4	2.71	1454/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	11	11	22	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	8	3	8	6	4	2.83	1328/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	9	14	17	10	3.42	1351/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	6	2	1	2	5	38	4.58	1011/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	7	20	13	4.15	769/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	4	16	22	4.43	904/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	4	11	27	4.55	1123/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	5	15	20	4.32	814/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	5	6	10	17	3.80	1170/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	10	2	2	5	7	12	3.89	701/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	4	12	12	15	3.43	1066/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	10	16	19	3.90	1013/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	5	10	15	16	3.63	1089/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	5	4	11	8	19	3.68	616/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.68	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	4
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 12	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 55
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 244
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	9	10	17	12	3.37	1445/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	8	5	17	19	5	3.15	1467/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	6	10	19	10	3.28	1220/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	7	9	9	5	4	2.71	1454/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	2.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	11	11	22	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	8	3	8	6	4	2.83	1328/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	9	14	17	10	3.42	1351/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	6	2	1	2	5	38	4.58	1011/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	5	5	14	14	3	3.12	1405/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	6	3	4	11	17	3.73	1311/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	5	1	5	11	20	3.95	1369/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	7	1	9	12	11	3.47	1291/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	1	12	4	4	9	10	3.03	1362/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	12	3	3	5	6	8	3.52	891/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	4	12	12	15	3.43	1066/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	10	16	19	3.90	1013/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	5	5	10	15	16	3.63	1089/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	5	4	11	8	19	3.68	616/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.68	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	4
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 12	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 55
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 245
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	4	16	20	14	3.62	1356/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	7	25	13	9	3.28	1435/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	9	16	14	15	3.55	1151/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	1	5	8	14	6	3.56	1302/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	17	13	21	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	36	0	2	10	7	1	3.35	1219/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	20	17	14	3.60	1262/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	13	0	2	0	1	41	4.84	623/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	10	8	18	11	1	2.69	1467/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	7	21	10	16	3.55	1352/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	4	15	11	24	3.96	1365/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	7	12	19	10	6	2.93	1395/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	12	13	7	11	6	7	2.70	1391/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	6	6	14	8	12	3.30	995/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	2	12	10	19	3.64	969/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	9	9	25	4.06	913/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	6	0	10	11	22	3.88	972/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	4	2	10	2	25	3.98	455/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.98	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 1	B 19		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 60 Non-major 58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 44	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 246
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	4	16	20	14	3.62	1356/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	7	25	13	9	3.28	1435/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	9	16	14	15	3.55	1151/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	1	5	8	14	6	3.56	1302/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	17	13	21	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	36	0	2	10	7	1	3.35	1219/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	20	17	14	3.60	1262/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	13	0	2	0	1	41	4.84	623/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	5	5	21	16	3	3.14	1400/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	2	0	12	9	18	4.00	1186/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	2	1	8	8	22	4.15	1332/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	4	1	14	9	9	3.49	1288/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	2	7	5	8	8	9	3.19	1346/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	6	3	2	6	10	12	3.79	770/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	2	12	10	19	3.64	969/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	9	9	25	4.06	913/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	6	0	10	11	22	3.88	972/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	4	2	10	2	25	3.98	455/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.98	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 247
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	4	16	20	14	3.62	1356/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	7	25	13	9	3.28	1435/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	9	16	14	15	3.55	1151/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	1	5	8	14	6	3.56	1302/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	17	13	21	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	36	0	2	10	7	1	3.35	1219/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	20	17	14	3.60	1262/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	13	0	2	0	1	41	4.84	623/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	24	23	4.37	534/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	8	9	22	4.36	969/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	5	16	17	4.32	1279/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	1	1	7	11	15	4.09	1013/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	3	11	6	17	4.00	1036/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	10	2	0	5	8	13	4.07	582/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	2	12	10	19	3.64	969/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	9	9	25	4.06	913/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	6	0	10	11	22	3.88	972/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	4	2	10	2	25	3.98	455/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.98	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 1	B 19	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 9	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 7	D 2	Under-grad	60
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	44
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 248
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	4	16	20	14	3.62	1356/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	7	25	13	9	3.28	1435/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	2	9	16	14	15	3.55	1151/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	24	1	5	8	14	6	3.56	1302/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	17	13	21	4.00	760/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	36	0	2	10	7	1	3.35	1219/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	20	17	14	3.60	1262/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	13	0	2	0	1	41	4.84	623/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	377/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	41	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	1079/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.03	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	1329/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	42	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	1029/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	1	0	2	6	2	7	3.82	1161/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	7	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	7	2	12	10	19	3.64	969/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	9	9	25	4.06	913/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	6	0	10	11	22	3.88	972/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	4	2	10	2	25	3.98	455/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.98	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 249
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	12	15	18	3.72	1315/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	15	13	3.47	1376/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	2	14	18	15	3.77	1083/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	3	13	11	12	3.75	1198/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	8	13	22	4.15	655/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	1	6	9	13	4.07	774/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	3	20	6	21	3.84	1123/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	7	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	7	7	7	12	10	5	2.98	1424/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	4	5	15	24	4.04	1174/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	2	5	15	27	4.24	1307/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	7	7	9	8	20	3.53	1277/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	4	10	3	8	10	17	3.44	1294/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	5	10	13	21	3.96	641/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	0	5	21	17	4.00	718/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	1	2	13	27	4.23	819/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	0	9	14	20	3.98	900/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.98	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	3	6	10	24	4.28	319/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 249
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 17	General 0	Under-grad 54 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 38	
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 250
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	12	15	18	3.72	1315/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	15	13	3.47	1376/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	2	14	18	15	3.77	1083/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	3	13	11	12	3.75	1198/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	8	13	22	4.15	655/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	1	6	9	13	4.07	774/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	3	20	6	21	3.84	1123/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	7	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	1	4	19	14	3	3.34	1343/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	2	0	6	6	17	4.16	1112/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	1224/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	3	6	8	11	3.96	1096/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	3	3	7	6	9	3.54	1261/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	1	3	2	6	4	13	3.79	770/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	0	5	21	17	4.00	718/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	1	2	13	27	4.23	819/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	0	9	14	20	3.98	900/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.98	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	3	6	10	24	4.28	319/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 250
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 17	General 0	Under-grad 54 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 38		
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 251
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	12	15	18	3.72	1315/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	15	13	3.47	1376/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	2	14	18	15	3.77	1083/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	3	13	11	12	3.75	1198/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	8	13	22	4.15	655/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	1	6	9	13	4.07	774/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	3	20	6	21	3.84	1123/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	7	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	4	0	0	4	21	15	4.28	633/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	904/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	1	9	16	4.48	1173/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	1	1	6	16	4.40	720/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	2	3	8	11	4.17	949/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	7	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	500/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	0	5	21	17	4.00	718/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	1	2	13	27	4.23	819/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	0	9	14	20	3.98	900/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.98	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	3	6	10	24	4.28	319/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 251
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 17	General 0	Under-grad 54 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 38		
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 252
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	5	3	12	15	18	3.72	1315/1522	3.62	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	4	15	15	13	3.47	1376/1522	3.34	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	2	14	18	15	3.77	1083/1285	3.45	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	3	13	11	12	3.75	1198/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	2	8	13	22	4.15	655/1412	3.99	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	22	1	1	6	9	13	4.07	774/1381	3.29	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	3	20	6	21	3.84	1123/1500	3.50	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	7	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	438/1517	4.77	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	4	1	1	6	19	14	4.07	852/1497	3.56	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	904/1440	3.99	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	2	2	7	16	4.37	1253/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	1	1	6	16	4.40	720/1436	3.77	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	3	2	8	11	4.13	977/1432	3.54	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	7	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	500/1221	3.72	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.04	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	0	5	21	17	4.00	718/1280	3.73	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	1	2	13	27	4.23	819/1277	4.13	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	0	9	14	20	3.98	900/1269	3.77	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.98	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	3	6	10	24	4.28	319/ 854	3.94	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 252
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 17	General 0	Under-grad 54 Non-major 51
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 38		
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 253
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1365/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1497/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1142/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	1493/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1359/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1397/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	3.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1403/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	1418/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1028/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	874/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1113/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1238/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	673/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: LACOURSE, WILL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 254
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1365/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1497/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1142/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1419/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	3.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1282/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	874/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1113/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1238/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	673/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: LONGENBERGE, J (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 255
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1365/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1497/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1142/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1419/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	3.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1056/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	874/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1113/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1238/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	673/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 256
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1365/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1497/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1142/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	839/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1458/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1419/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	3.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1419/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	874/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1113/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1238/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	673/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: BUSH, ALLEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 257
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	1210/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	3.75	1267/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1210/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1391/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	850/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	3	2	3	2	0	2.40	1482/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1347/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1419/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3.08	1374/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1311/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	2	2	2	1	2.60	1154/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	718/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	594/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	951/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	246/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 258
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	1210/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	3.75	1267/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1210/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1391/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	850/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	833/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1023/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	935/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1177/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1036/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	860/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	718/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	594/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	951/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	246/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 259
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	1210/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	3.75	1267/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1210/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1391/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	850/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	2	3	4	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1318/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1353/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1364/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	832/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	718/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	594/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	951/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	246/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM II - HONO
 Instructor: KRUG, JEANETTE (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 260
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	10	1	3.92	1210/1522	3.76	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	3.75	1267/1522	3.28	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	3	3.33	1210/1285	3.47	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1391/1476	3.20	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	265/1412	4.31	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1286/1381	3.00	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	850/1500	4.19	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	3	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	718/1497	3.24	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1186/1440	3.82	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1353/1448	3.81	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1346/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1156/1432	3.24	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	832/1221	3.35	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	718/1280	3.90	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	594/1277	4.05	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	951/1269	3.36	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	246/ 854	3.96	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

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	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 261
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	6	5	3.79	1279/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	976/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	5	6	4	3.71	1222/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	728/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1076/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	4	6	3.55	1280/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	1128/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	865/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	946/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	859/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	762/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	991/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	899/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1031/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	875/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	155/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	129/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.35	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	112/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	151/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.28	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	141/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 261
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 262
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	6	5	3.79	1279/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	976/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	5	6	4	3.71	1222/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	728/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1076/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	4	6	3.55	1280/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	1128/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	898/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	917/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1232/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	855/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	935/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1031/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1136/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	875/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	155/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	129/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.35	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	112/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	151/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.28	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	141/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 262
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 263
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	4	6	7	2	3.37	1447/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	7	2	3.26	1438/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1142/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	2	4	4	5	3.33	1363/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	4	5	3.37	1243/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1198/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	5	1	8	3.67	1236/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1062/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	3	8	3	3.69	1192/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	1148/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	1097/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	1056/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	2	5	3	0	3.10	1053/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1161/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1248/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	194/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	194/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	3.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	199/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	3.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	191/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	3.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	161/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 263
 JUN 26, 2007
 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 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	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		
			? 0	Other 16	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 264
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	4	6	7	2	3.37	1447/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	6	7	2	3.26	1438/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1142/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	2	4	4	5	3.33	1363/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	4	5	3.37	1243/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1198/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	5	1	8	3.67	1236/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1062/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	6	4	0	2.86	1444/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	5	2	4	1	3.08	1402/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	3.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	4	3	0	5	3.31	1435/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	5	5	2	1	2.92	1395/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	4	3	1	1	2.55	1399/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1161/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1248/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	194/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	194/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	199/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	3.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	191/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	3.62
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	161/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	3.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0102
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 264
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 265
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	12	5	3.87	1239/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	10	5	3.65	1306/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1061/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	8	3	7	3.57	1293/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	594/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	753/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	6	1	8	3.32	1384/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1120/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	9	1	3.73	1160/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	976/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	897/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	10	9	4.18	942/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	4	10	3.87	1143/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	5	2	1	3	4	2.93	1094/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1133/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	162/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	110/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.41	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	131/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.47	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	171/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.12	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	173/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	Under-grad	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Non-major	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	19

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0103
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 266
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	12	5	3.87	1239/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	10	5	3.65	1306/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1061/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	8	3	7	3.57	1293/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	10	4.23	594/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	753/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	6	1	8	3.32	1384/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	10	4.45	1120/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	7	4	2	3.62	1233/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1148/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	1284/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	1117/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	5	6	5	3.55	1256/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	524/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1133/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	162/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	110/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.41	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	131/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.47	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	1	0	8	7	4.12	171/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.12	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	173/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 11	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	Under-grad	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	Non-major	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	19

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 267
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	9	7	3.91	1210/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	6	4.00	1080/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1181/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	987/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	826/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	806/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	8	7	4	3.50	1298/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	20	2	4.91	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	13	3	3.90	1034/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	837/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	897/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	783/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	8	12	4.22	914/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	3	2	2	4	3.23	1018/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	2	0	4	0	2.75	1240/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	1174/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	107/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	120/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	131/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.48	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	5	3	11	4.20	162/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	1	0	10	7	4.28	105/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.28	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 267
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 23 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 268
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	9	7	3.91	1210/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	6	4.00	1080/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1181/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	987/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	826/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	806/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	8	7	4	3.50	1298/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	8	5	3.90	1034/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1262/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	1322/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1169/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	2	1	8	3.56	1253/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	11	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	****/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	2	0	4	0	2.75	1240/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	1174/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	107/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	120/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	131/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.48	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	1	5	3	11	4.20	162/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	3	0	1	0	10	7	4.28	105/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.28	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0104
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 268
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 269
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	14	6	4.08	1067/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	834/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	13	5	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	1009/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	493/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	7	3	5	3.75	1046/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	8	7	8	3.88	1105/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	767/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	3	10	3	3.82	1097/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	1015/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	683/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	14	9	4.33	793/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	9	10	4.13	977/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	956/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	0	3	6	3.75	907/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	804/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	997/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	80/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	58/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	87/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	112/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	86/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 24	Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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 19		
				? 0			

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 270
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	14	6	4.08	1067/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	834/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	13	5	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	5	9	7	4.00	1009/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	493/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	7	3	5	3.75	1046/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	8	7	8	3.88	1105/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	1	20	4.77	767/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	993/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	604/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	916/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	514/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	558/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	850/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	0	3	6	3.75	907/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	804/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	997/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	80/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	58/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	87/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	112/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	86/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 24	Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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 19		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 271
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	4.00	1122/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	6	4.21	914/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1164/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	475/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	984/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	10	3	3.79	1161/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	932/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	10	1	3.73	1160/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	432/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1089/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	457/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	854/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1053/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1171/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	121/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	69/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	116/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	58/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	59/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106
Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

University of Maryland
Baltimore County

Page 271
JUN 26, 2007

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 272
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	5	7	4.00	1122/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	12	6	4.21	914/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1164/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	475/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	984/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	10	3	3.79	1161/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	932/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	622/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	705/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1258/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	478/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	793/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1171/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	121/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	69/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	116/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	58/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	59/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0106
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 272
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 273
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	13	5	4.05	1094/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	824/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1097/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	4	10	0	3.60	1281/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	1	8	7	4.11	688/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	806/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	1123/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	767/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	622/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	552/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	840/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	636/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	9	7	4.29	854/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	814/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	145/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	160/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	112/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	121/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	4	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	93/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	

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
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Non-major 21
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0107
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 274
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	13	5	4.05	1094/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	824/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1097/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	4	10	0	3.60	1281/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	1	8	7	4.11	688/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	0	2	11	2	4.00	806/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	1123/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	767/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	304/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	798/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	965/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	720/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	928/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	145/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	160/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	112/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	121/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	4	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	93/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	

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
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 13
				? 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 275
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	1	8	8	3.95	1171/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	763/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	809/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	769/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	655/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	885/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	4	4	9	3.95	1048/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	714/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	820/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	353/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	765/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	539/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	758/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	4	0	2	1	7	3.50	899/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	157/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	154/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	150/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	178/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	3.95	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	78/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0108
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 276
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	1	8	8	3.95	1171/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	763/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	809/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	769/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	655/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	885/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	4	4	9	3.95	1048/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	714/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	7	4	1	3.14	1400/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	682/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1381/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1013/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1182/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	524/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	157/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	154/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	150/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	178/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	3.95	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	78/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 277
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	791/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	763/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1198/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	6	2	11	4.26	557/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	779/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	9	3	5	3.45	1327/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	4	16	4	4.80	714/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	5	9	3	3.78	1133/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	877/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	1207/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	672/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	3	4	10	4.05	1013/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	818/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	89/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	63/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	63/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	137/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	34/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0109
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 278
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	791/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	763/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	938/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1198/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	6	2	11	4.26	557/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	779/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	2	9	3	5	3.45	1327/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	714/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	4	11	2	3.78	1133/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	1015/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1207/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	835/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	1036/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	8	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	540/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	89/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	63/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	63/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	137/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	3	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	34/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0	Under-grad	24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	15
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 279
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	1	2	8	4	3.50	1402/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	1146/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	794/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	924/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	1189/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	1028/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1141/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	532/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	979/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	877/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	954/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	772/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1013/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	524/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1207/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	197/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	3.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	165/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	55/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	92/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0110
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 280
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	1	2	8	4	3.50	1402/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	1146/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	794/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	924/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	1189/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	1028/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1141/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	532/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	744/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1159/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1157/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	916/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1148/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1207/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	2	0	2	3	4	3.64	197/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	3.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	165/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	55/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	92/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 281
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	3	9	4	3.55	1383/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	976/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	898/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	924/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	520/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	663/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	839/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	8	3	3.88	1057/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	1148/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	1013/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1003/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	7	7	3.75	1191/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	803/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1161/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	161/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	141/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	71/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	90/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	86/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 281
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 282
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	3	9	4	3.55	1383/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	976/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	898/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	924/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	520/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	663/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	839/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	138/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	492/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	765/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	248/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	732/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	707/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1161/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	161/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	141/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	71/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	90/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	86/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0111
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 282
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 283
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	1122/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	8	4.09	1032/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	833/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	956/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	728/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	885/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	13	4	3.82	1141/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	6	8	2	3.75	1147/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	5	12	4.23	1071/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	977/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	5	10	4.00	1056/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	2	8	6	3.67	1224/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	1	3	3	4	3.29	1001/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1126/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1203/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1111/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	698/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	63/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	150/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.28	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	123/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	1	2	0	2	12	4.29	148/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	1	2	12	4.22	113/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	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	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0112
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 284
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	1122/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	8	4.09	1032/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	833/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	956/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	728/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	885/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	13	4	3.82	1141/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	363/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	837/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	897/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	394/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	775/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1053/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1126/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1203/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1111/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	698/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	63/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	150/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.28	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	0	2	14	4.50	123/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	1	2	0	2	12	4.29	148/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	1	2	12	4.22	113/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	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	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				Other	13						
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 285
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	1060/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	10	4.24	894/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	531/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1009/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	7	10	4.20	621/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	673/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	4	10	4.00	988/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	714/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	1	8	3	3.86	1073/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	837/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	1001/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	7	11	4.29	845/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	10	4.10	995/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	4	1	4	4	3.13	1048/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	3	0	3	3.00	1187/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	2	2	1	2.60	1250/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	77/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.59	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	129/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.35	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	84/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	80/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	130/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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 19		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0113
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: MESSENGER, TASH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 286
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	1060/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	8	10	4.24	894/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	531/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1009/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	7	10	4.20	621/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	673/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	4	10	4.00	988/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	714/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	554/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	669/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	1114/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	696/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	707/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	832/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	2	3	0	3	3.00	1187/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1214/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	2	2	1	2.60	1250/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	77/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.59	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	129/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.35	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	84/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	80/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	130/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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 19		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 287
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	1060/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	935/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	5	8	3	3.71	1111/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	1164/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	655/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	885/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	1038/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	756/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	774/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	935/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	825/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	10	4.33	820/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	3	4	6	3	3.56	875/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	996/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1038/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1141/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	737/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	124/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.31	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	123/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	170/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	146/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	6	7	4.13	135/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0114
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: WARD, DAWN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 288
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	1060/1522	3.90	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	935/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	5	8	3	3.71	1111/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.22	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	1164/1476	3.88	3.82	4.22	4.09	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	655/1412	4.07	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	885/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	3.93	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	11	5	3.95	1038/1500	3.77	3.91	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	487/1517	4.75	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	481/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	774/1440	4.38	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1114/1448	4.54	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	793/1436	4.28	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	854/1432	4.05	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	1	0	5	3	3.80	759/1221	3.55	3.66	3.93	3.86	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	996/1280	3.27	3.73	4.10	3.92	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1038/1277	3.35	3.94	4.34	4.13	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1141/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.04	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	737/ 854	3.36	3.92	4.02	3.87	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	124/ 215	4.23	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.31	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	123/ 228	4.36	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	170/ 217	4.53	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	146/ 216	4.38	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.31	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	6	7	4.13	135/ 205	4.27	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 124 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 289
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	11	27	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	29	4.74	277/1522	4.74	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	24	4.53	509/1285	4.53	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	178/1476	4.80	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	3	3	6	3	12	3.67	1077/1412	3.67	3.91	4.06	4.01	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	111/1381	4.83	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	10	27	4.68	287/1500	4.68	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	26	11	4.26	1262/1517	4.26	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	25	4.76	189/1497	4.76	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	58/1440	4.97	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.97	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	444/1448	4.92	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	110/1436	4.91	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	49/1432	4.97	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	343/1221	4.42	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	553/1280	4.30	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	3	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	38
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	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	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 290
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	492/1522	4.63	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1522	4.72	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	278/1285	4.75	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	454/1476	4.46	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	466/1412	4.50	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	633/1381	4.48	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	527/1500	4.33	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1019/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	189/1497	4.40	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	353/1440	4.71	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	296/1448	4.77	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	170/1436	4.79	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	418/1432	4.71	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	175/1221	4.54	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	530/1280	4.36	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1277	4.59	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	798/1269	4.24	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	47/ 215	4.84	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	29/ 228	4.94	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	39/ 217	4.88	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.89	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	113/ 216	4.70	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	67/ 205	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 47	4.50	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 34	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 18	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 290
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: KARR, JESSE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 291
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	492/1522	4.63	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1522	4.72	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	278/1285	4.75	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	454/1476	4.46	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	466/1412	4.50	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	633/1381	4.48	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	13	4.47	527/1500	4.33	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1019/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	898/1497	4.40	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	604/1440	4.71	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1114/1448	4.77	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1436	4.79	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1432	4.71	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1221	4.54	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	530/1280	4.36	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1277	4.59	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	798/1269	4.24	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	194/ 854	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	47/ 215	4.84	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	29/ 228	4.94	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	39/ 217	4.88	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.89	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	113/ 216	4.70	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	67/ 205	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 47	4.50	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 34	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 18	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: KARR, JESSE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 291
 JUN 26, 2007
 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 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 292
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1522	4.63	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	4.72	3.95	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.75	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1476	4.46	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1412	4.50	3.91	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	95/1381	4.48	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	750/1500	4.33	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	506/1497	4.40	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	798/1440	4.71	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	4.77	4.40	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1436	4.79	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1432	4.71	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1221	4.54	3.66	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.36	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	4.59	3.94	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.24	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	34/ 215	4.84	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 228	4.94	4.38	4.35	4.33	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 217	4.88	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 216	4.70	4.32	4.42	4.41	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	23/ 205	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.11	3.79	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 47	4.50	4.50	4.41	3.90	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.90	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.40	3.99	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 34	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 37	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.53	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.19	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	12/ 18	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.11	4.50	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: TYMINSKI, FRAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 292
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: RAJU, KHATRI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 293
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1522	4.63	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	4.72	3.95	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.75	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	357/1476	4.46	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1412	4.50	3.91	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	95/1381	4.48	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	750/1500	4.33	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	385/1497	4.40	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	4.71	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.77	4.40	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	4.79	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.71	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	4.54	3.66	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1280	4.36	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	4.59	3.94	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	777/1269	4.24	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	34/ 215	4.84	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 228	4.94	4.38	4.35	4.33	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 217	4.88	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 216	4.70	4.32	4.42	4.41	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	23/ 205	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.11	3.79	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 47	4.50	4.50	4.41	3.90	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.90	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.40	3.99	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 34	4.50	4.50	4.30	4.11	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 37	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.53	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.19	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	12/ 18	4.50	4.50	4.49	4.11	4.50	

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0102
 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA
 Instructor: RAJU, KHATRI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 293
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 294
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	707/1522	4.63	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	592/1522	4.72	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	298/1285	4.75	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	0	3	11	4.24	815/1476	4.46	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	671/1412	4.50	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	495/1381	4.48	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	809/1500	4.33	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	749/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	264/1497	4.40	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	224/1440	4.71	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.77	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	141/1436	4.79	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	454/1432	4.71	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	335/1221	4.54	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	2	8	4.00	718/1280	4.36	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	573/1277	4.59	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	0	9	4.25	777/1269	4.24	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 854	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	36/ 215	4.84	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.87	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	19/ 228	4.94	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	44/ 217	4.88	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.87	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	2	0	0	11	4.54	116/ 216	4.70	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.54	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	63/ 205	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.50	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	16	
?	0			

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 295
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	707/1522	4.63	4.02	4.30	4.14	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	592/1522	4.72	3.95	4.26	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	298/1285	4.75	3.94	4.30	4.22	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	0	3	11	4.24	815/1476	4.46	3.82	4.22	4.09	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	671/1412	4.50	3.91	4.06	4.01	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	495/1381	4.48	3.76	4.08	3.93	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	809/1500	4.33	3.91	4.18	4.16	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	749/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	839/1497	4.40	3.83	4.11	4.02	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	931/1440	4.71	4.24	4.45	4.40	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1319/1448	4.77	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	672/1436	4.79	3.99	4.29	4.24	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	707/1432	4.71	3.86	4.29	4.23	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	871/1221	4.54	3.66	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	2	8	4.00	718/1280	4.36	3.73	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	573/1277	4.59	3.94	4.34	4.13	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	0	9	4.25	777/1269	4.24	3.68	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 854	4.75	3.92	4.02	3.87	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	36/ 215	4.84	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.87	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	19/ 228	4.94	4.38	4.35	4.33	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	44/ 217	4.88	4.52	4.51	4.51	4.87	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	2	0	0	11	4.54	116/ 216	4.70	4.32	4.42	4.41	4.54	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	63/ 205	4.65	4.23	4.23	4.28	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.03	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	4.50	4.50	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.50	4.50	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	4.50	4.50	4.30	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	4.50	4.50	4.63	4.53	****	

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	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	16	
?	0			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: FABRIS, DANIEL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 296
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1522/1522	1.00	4.02	4.30	4.34	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1522/1522	1.00	3.95	4.26	4.25	1.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1285/1285	1.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1476/1476	1.00	3.82	4.22	4.26	1.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1410/1412	1.00	3.91	4.06	4.03	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1381/1381	1.00	3.76	4.08	4.13	1.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1498/1500	1.00	3.91	4.18	4.13	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1486/1497	2.00	3.83	4.11	4.13	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1440/1440	1.00	4.24	4.45	4.46	1.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1448/1448	2.00	4.40	4.71	4.71	2.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1435/1436	1.00	3.99	4.29	4.30	1.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1430/1432	1.00	3.86	4.29	4.29	1.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1216/1221	1.00	3.66	3.93	3.94	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 302 0101
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 297
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	13	9	4.08	1074/1522	4.08	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	12	6	3.77	1262/1522	3.77	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	10	12	4.15	841/1285	4.15	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	892/1476	4.17	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	4	0	7	3	6	3.35	1248/1412	3.35	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	1	4	1	8	3.75	1046/1381	3.75	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	3	3	5	4	6	3.33	1378/1500	3.33	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	1104/1517	4.48	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	2	7	5	5	3.68	1192/1497	3.68	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	4	4	9	8	3.84	1273/1440	3.84	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	21	4.73	897/1448	4.73	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	8	8	3	3.25	1350/1436	3.25	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	3	8	9	3.83	1156/1432	3.83	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	1	0	6	2	3.45	927/1221	3.45	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101
 Title: PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM
 Instructor: GREGURICK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 298
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	12	18	4.19	970/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	19	4.27	854/1522	4.27	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	6	24	4.46	590/1285	4.46	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	519/1476	4.48	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	11	6	13	3.76	1005/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1028/1381	3.79	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	9	25	4.64	349/1500	4.64	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	18	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	7	13	10	3.97	952/1497	3.97	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	27	4.69	578/1440	4.69	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	30	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	6	13	14	4.09	1013/1436	4.09	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	22	4.47	669/1432	4.47	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	24	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	****/1221	****	3.66	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 36 Non-major 36
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 32	
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 299
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.68	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.57	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.68	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	339/1412	4.25	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.57	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.68	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	385/1497	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	4.44	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	3.67	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	3.67	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	3.00	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	585/1280	4.25	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	930/1277	4.00	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1174/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 215	4.25	4.31	4.36	4.21	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	170/ 217	4.25	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	121/ 216	4.63	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	33/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.75	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: BALU, RAD (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 300
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.68	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.57	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.68	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	339/1412	4.25	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.57	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.68	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1186/1440	4.44	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1353/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.67	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1364/1432	3.67	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1197/1221	3.00	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	585/1280	4.25	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	930/1277	4.00	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1174/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 215	4.25	4.31	4.36	4.21	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	170/ 217	4.25	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	121/ 216	4.63	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	33/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.75	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 301
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.68	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.57	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.68	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	339/1412	4.25	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.57	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.68	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1186/1440	4.44	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1353/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.67	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1364/1432	3.67	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1197/1221	3.00	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	585/1280	4.25	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	930/1277	4.00	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1174/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 215	4.25	4.31	4.36	4.21	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	170/ 217	4.25	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	121/ 216	4.63	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	33/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.75	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 302
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1522	4.68	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1522	4.57	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.68	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.25	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	434/1381	4.57	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	387/1500	4.68	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	452/1440	4.44	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1448	4.42	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1241/1436	3.67	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1224/1432	3.67	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	3.00	3.66	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	4.25	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	4.00	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	202/ 215	4.25	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	170/ 217	4.25	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	69/ 216	4.63	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	108/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.25	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: BALU, RAD (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 303
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1522	4.68	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1522	4.57	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.68	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.25	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	434/1381	4.57	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	387/1500	4.68	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	654/1497	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	4.25	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	4.00	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	202/ 215	4.25	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	170/ 217	4.25	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	69/ 216	4.63	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	108/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.25	

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 1		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0102
 Title ADVANCED LAB II
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILIANG (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 304
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	492/1522	4.68	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1522	4.57	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	378/1476	4.68	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	760/1412	4.25	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	434/1381	4.57	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	387/1500	4.68	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1346/1497	4.00	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	4.25	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	4.00	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	3.25	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	202/ 215	4.25	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	170/ 217	4.25	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	69/ 216	4.63	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	108/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.25	

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK
 Enrollment: 189
 Questionnaires: 99

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 305
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	4	5	20	20	45	4.03	1101/1522	4.03	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	6	27	28	31	3.85	1217/1522	3.85	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	2	8	21	29	33	3.89	1030/1285	3.89	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	24	4	3	19	20	23	3.80	1178/1476	3.80	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	2	0	17	29	42	4.21	603/1412	4.21	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	39	8	5	12	13	16	3.44	1179/1381	3.44	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	3	7	14	32	35	3.98	1018/1500	3.98	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	1	0	4	84	4.92	389/1517	4.92	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	3	6	18	29	19	3.73	1160/1497	3.73	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	2	12	31	43	4.20	1094/1440	4.20	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	5	14	72	4.74	897/1448	4.74	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	10	24	26	27	3.68	1234/1436	3.68	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	6	10	15	24	36	3.81	1165/1432	3.81	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	8	1	6	12	19	41	4.18	516/1221	4.18	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	63	0	2	1	6	9	18	4.11	677/1280	4.11	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	63	0	3	2	6	7	18	3.97	954/1277	3.97	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	65	0	1	1	6	5	21	4.29	749/1269	4.29	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	64	2	1	2	4	5	21	4.30	303/ 854	4.30	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	0	0	3	4	3	6	3.75	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	0	3	0	0	1	8	3.92	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	88	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	98	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	98	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	98	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	98	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	97	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK
Enrollment: 189
Questionnaires: 99

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2007

Page 305
JUN 26, 2007
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 5
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 32		
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 15	C 30	General 0	Under-grad 98 Non-major 94
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 13	D 1		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 13	F 1	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 75	
			? 6		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 306
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1295/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1324/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1077/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1286/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1056/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1410/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	1.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1031/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: ZINK, NICK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 307
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1295/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	938/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1324/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1077/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1286/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1353/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1056/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1426/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	1.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1031/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.50	594/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 308
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	814/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	787/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	809/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1159/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	948/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	693/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	988/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	718/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	716/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1097/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	972/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1148/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	606/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	671/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	89/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	71/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	69/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2007

Page 308
JUN 26, 2007
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TANTRAVEDI, SAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 309
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	814/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	787/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	809/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1159/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	948/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	693/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	988/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	654/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1319/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1282/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1270/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	692/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	671/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	89/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	71/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	69/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0102
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: TANTRAVEDI, SAR (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2007

Page 309
JUN 26, 2007
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 310
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1012/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1080/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	938/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1269/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	566/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	713/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	913/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1174/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	765/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	601/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	928/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1011/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1187/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1214/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	200/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	203/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	102/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	200/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	118/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.20	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	4

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0103
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 311
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1012/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1080/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	938/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1269/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	566/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	713/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	913/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1113/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1187/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1214/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	200/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	203/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	102/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	200/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	118/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.20	

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 2		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	9
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 312
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1387/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1280/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1185/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1263/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	964/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	806/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1249/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1057/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	864/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1036/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	1056/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1203/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	786/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	718/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	930/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1117/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	139/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	178/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	177/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	141/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0104
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: LU, XUEFANG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 313
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1387/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1280/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1185/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1263/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	964/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	806/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1249/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1250/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1385/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1441/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1378/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1330/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	718/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	930/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1117/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	139/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	178/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	177/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	141/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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 2007

Page 314
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1269/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	702/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	938/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	473/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	475/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	663/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	541/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	994/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	602/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	763/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	656/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	708/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	847/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	461/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	718/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	849/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	1263/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	139/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	5.00	

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 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	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	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: ZINK, NICK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 315
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1269/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	702/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	938/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	473/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	475/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	663/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	541/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	994/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	457/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1207/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	672/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1191/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	718/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	849/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	1263/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	139/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	35/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	35/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.90	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	5.00	

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 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	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	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 316
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1122/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	1	4	3.69	1293/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1123/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1009/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	760/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	953/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	1	4	3.38	1363/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	1177/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	6	1	3.42	1320/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1304/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	859/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1273/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1165/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	448/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	102/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	0	0	2	4	3.44	215/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	203/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	3.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	171/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.11	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	96/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	Major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	Non-major 12
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TANTRAVEDI, SAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 317
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1122/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	1	4	3.69	1293/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1123/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1009/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	760/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	953/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	1	4	3.38	1363/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	1177/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	839/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	656/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1097/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	972/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1363/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	102/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	3	0	0	2	4	3.44	215/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	203/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	3.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	171/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	96/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 318
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	5	8	0	3.43	1433/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	1319/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	3	7	0	3.33	1210/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	3	7	1	3.58	1289/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1005/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1143/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1123/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1217/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	5	1	3.42	1320/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	7	2	3.64	1335/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1024/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1247/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	7	1	3.29	1330/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	752/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	0	1	4	3	3.36	207/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	165/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	184/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.11	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	4	4	2	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	135/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	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	11
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 319
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	5	8	0	3.43	1433/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	1319/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	3	7	0	3.33	1210/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	3	7	1	3.58	1289/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1005/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1143/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1123/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1217/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	5	4	1	3.45	1301/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1331/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	3	3	3	0	3.00	1441/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1301/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1353/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	983/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	0	1	4	3	3.36	207/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	165/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	184/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.11	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	4	4	2	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	3	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	135/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	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	11
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 320
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1305/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1244/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	882/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1009/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	989/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	6	0	3.15	1268/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1197/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1054/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	756/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1163/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	1190/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	3.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	1056/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1143/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	582/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	718/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1197/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1030/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	153/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	154/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	123/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	214/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	2.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	180/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	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	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0108
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: LU, XUEFANG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 321
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	1305/1522	3.84	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1244/1522	3.98	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	882/1285	3.84	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1009/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	989/1412	3.94	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	4	6	0	3.15	1268/1381	3.76	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1197/1500	3.96	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1054/1517	4.73	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	7	2	0	2.91	1438/1497	3.83	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	0	3	3	0	2.67	1425/1440	4.04	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1439/1448	4.25	4.40	4.71	4.71	3.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	2	3	2	0	2.40	1423/1436	3.81	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	1	2	2	1	2.50	1402/1432	3.42	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.75	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	718/1280	3.88	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1197/1277	3.88	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1030/1269	3.37	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	4.00	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	153/ 215	4.06	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	154/ 228	4.14	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	123/ 217	4.42	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	214/ 216	3.73	4.32	4.42	4.35	2.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	180/ 205	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	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	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA
 Enrollment: 121
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 322
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	4	7	22	30	4.19	970/1522	4.25	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	10	22	29	4.22	904/1522	4.22	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	9	23	28	4.16	841/1285	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	31	3	3	3	8	16	3.94	1091/1476	3.93	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	1	8	18	29	4.28	538/1412	4.19	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	47	0	2	6	3	5	3.69	****/1381	3.37	3.76	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	10	13	41	4.48	512/1500	4.40	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	48	4.75	802/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	1	1	6	23	18	4.14	782/1497	4.08	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	8	52	4.75	452/1440	4.70	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	10	52	4.78	802/1448	4.81	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	7	23	31	4.32	814/1436	4.25	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	12	11	35	4.23	907/1432	4.18	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	21	3	6	7	7	18	3.76	786/1221	3.64	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	50	0	5	0	5	3	3	2.94	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	1	0	7	1	6	3.73	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	52	11	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	65	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B 28	
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	7	C 13	General 1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	12	D 1	Under-grad 65
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	18	F 0	Non-major 60
				P 1	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 3
					Other 52

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 352 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: GIERASCH, TIFFA
 Enrollment: 181
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 323
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	11	26	45	4.31	849/1522	4.25	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	11	33	37	4.23	904/1522	4.22	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	14	33	32	4.04	921/1285	4.10	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	50	3	2	6	8	16	3.91	1115/1476	3.93	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	6	10	23	35	4.09	703/1412	4.19	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	55	3	6	5	9	7	3.37	1214/1381	3.37	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	4	32	43	4.32	710/1500	4.40	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	14	68	4.83	668/1517	4.79	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	3	13	35	23	4.01	891/1497	4.08	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	14	63	4.64	630/1440	4.70	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	6	75	4.85	656/1448	4.81	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	7	33	38	4.19	934/1436	4.25	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	5	7	23	44	4.14	963/1432	4.18	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	22	5	6	15	19	14	3.53	891/1221	3.64	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	80	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	80	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	83	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 217	****	4.52	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 216	****	4.32	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 205	****	4.23	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	84	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	84	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	84	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	84	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	84	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	85	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	84	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	84	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	84	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	23	2.00-2.99	5	C	23	General	2	Under-grad	86	Non-major	84
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	11	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	35	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	76				

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 324
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1279/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1042/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1074/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	735/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1094/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	768/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	3	3	3.57	1272/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1006/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1112/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1232/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1013/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1126/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	944/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	181/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	83/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	200/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	3.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	174/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	125/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.17	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: BROWN, ANDREW (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 325
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1279/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1042/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1074/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	735/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1094/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	768/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	7	3	3	3.57	1272/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	839/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1269/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1271/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1364/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	181/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	83/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	200/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	3.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	174/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	125/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.17	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 326
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	791/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1168/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	849/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	444/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	520/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	434/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	1123/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	852/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	532/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1024/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	772/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	732/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	232/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	89/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	69/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	85/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	106/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	168/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.80	

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0102
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: ZHAO, CHUMANG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 327
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	791/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1168/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	849/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	444/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	520/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	434/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	1123/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	898/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	984/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1206/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1224/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	89/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	69/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	85/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	106/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	168/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.80	

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 328
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1338/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	0	7	5	3.93	1157/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	4	3	3.47	1176/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	1293/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1195/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1310/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	2.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	2	3	3	2.93	1443/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	932/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1089/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	3	7	3.94	1232/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1279/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.12	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1169/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1165/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1117/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	181/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	201/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	185/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	193/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.58	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	181/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0103
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 329
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	4	5	4	3.67	1338/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	0	7	5	3.93	1157/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	4	3	3.47	1176/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	3	5	3	3.57	1293/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1195/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1310/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	2	3	3	2.93	1443/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	2.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	932/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	654/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1342/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1378/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	4	4	3.64	1247/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1309/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	2.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	181/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	201/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	185/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	193/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	3.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	181/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 330
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	899/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	965/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1088/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1009/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1054/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	693/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1183/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1034/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.01
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	917/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	1001/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	957/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	5	5	4.08	1000/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	808/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	930/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	77/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	98/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	185/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	151/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	120/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	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 5	Graduate	0
56-83	4	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	Other	11
			I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0104
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: HOLLAND, RYAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 331
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	899/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	965/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1088/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	1009/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1054/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	693/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1183/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	820/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	930/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	77/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	98/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	185/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	151/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	120/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	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		
			? 0	Other	11

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 332
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	2	5	3.86	1244/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1217/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1193/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1169/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1305/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1338/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	3	4	0	3	3.09	1422/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	7	1	3.75	1147/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	705/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	859/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	876/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1156/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1187/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1113/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	586/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	155/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	209/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	139/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	90/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	137/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 332
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	8	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 333
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	7	2	5	3.86	1244/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1217/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1193/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1169/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	4	4	1	3.18	1305/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1338/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	3	4	0	3	3.09	1422/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1221/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1318/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1290/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1282/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1270/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1187/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1113/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	586/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	155/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	209/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	139/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	90/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	137/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0105
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 333
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	8	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 334
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	605/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	545/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	703/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	760/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	780/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	898/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1047/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	601/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	194/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	135/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	159/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	90/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	141/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0106
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: ZHAO, CHUMANG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 335
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	605/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	545/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	703/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	760/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	780/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	573/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	194/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	135/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	159/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	90/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	141/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 336
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	707/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1083/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	966/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	865/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	643/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1272/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	6	1	3.55	1261/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	565/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	656/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	648/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	956/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	3	4	0	3.11	1050/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	133/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.23	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	173/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	85/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	156/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	141/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	6	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0107
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 337
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	707/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1080/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1083/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	966/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	865/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	643/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1272/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1325/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1047/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1415/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	876/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1036/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	133/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.23	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	173/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	85/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	156/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	141/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.00	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	6	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	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 338
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1210/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1037/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1088/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	871/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1257/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	482/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	6	1	3.36	1369/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	691/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	1221/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1252/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1258/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1251/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	0	6	3.82	1165/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	899/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	116/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	83/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	154/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	121/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	67/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.50	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	

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 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0108
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: HOLLAND, RYAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 339
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1210/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1037/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1088/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	871/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1257/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	482/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	6	1	3.36	1369/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	691/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	544/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1300/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1335/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	116/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	83/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	154/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	121/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	67/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.50	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 10
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 12

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 340
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	1012/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	996/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	5	7	4.21	794/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	735/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1013/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1081/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1257/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1140/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	931/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	1190/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	793/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	758/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1064/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1081/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	930/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1144/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	168/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	135/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	147/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	165/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	125/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 340
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: BROWN, ANDREW (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 341
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	1012/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	996/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	5	7	4.21	794/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	735/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1013/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1081/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1257/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1140/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1148/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1300/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1147/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	0	3	3	3.09	1355/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1193/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1081/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	930/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	0	0	3	3.40	1144/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	168/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	135/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	147/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	165/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	125/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0109
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: BROWN, ANDREW (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 341
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 342
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1074/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1222/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	780/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	1009/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	1189/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	703/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	5	5	3.77	1175/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1221/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	1063/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1060/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	896/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	899/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	739/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1050/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	671/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	157/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	171/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.10	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	123/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	121/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	38/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.70	

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 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0110
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TEMBURNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 343
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1074/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1222/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	780/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	1009/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	1189/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	703/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	5	5	3.77	1175/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1361/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1186/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1353/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1241/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1050/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	671/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	157/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	171/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.10	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	123/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	121/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	38/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.70	

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 344
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	929/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	787/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1078/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1077/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	743/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	924/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	333/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	604/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	683/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	601/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	254/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	74/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	106/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	62/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.60	

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	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 9
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Electives 0
					Other 7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0111
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SHAH, NITI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 345
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	929/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	787/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1078/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	827/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1077/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	743/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	924/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	898/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	601/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	74/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	35/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	58/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	106/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	62/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.60	

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	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 9
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Electives 0
					Other 7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 346
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	929/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1146/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	4	4.06	910/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1169/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	5	6	1	3.33	1257/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1008/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	4	5	3	3.35	1372/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	532/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	7	7	3	3.61	1233/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	1071/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1060/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	995/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1013/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1064/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	78/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	162/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	181/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	95/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	161/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0112
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 347
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	929/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1146/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	4	4.06	910/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1169/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	5	6	1	3.33	1257/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	2	6	5	3.81	1008/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	4	5	3	3.35	1372/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	532/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	493/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.01	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	763/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	897/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	514/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	914/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	78/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	162/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	181/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	4.14	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	95/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	161/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 348
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	899/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1206/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	938/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	934/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	948/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	272/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1183/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	807/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1023/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1332/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1177/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	963/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	899/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1250/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1272/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1258/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	153/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	45/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	69/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	56/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 348
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 349
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	899/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1206/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	938/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	934/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	948/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	272/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1183/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1186/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1157/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1056/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1250/1280	3.59	3.73	4.10	4.14	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1272/1277	3.55	3.94	4.34	4.38	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1258/1269	3.83	3.68	4.31	4.39	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	153/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	45/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	69/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	56/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0113
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 349
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 350
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	178/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	141/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 0114
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: CHAKRABORTY, SA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 351
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.19	4.02	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	4.12	3.95	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	3.97	3.94	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.09	3.82	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	3.76	3.91	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	3.93	3.76	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	3.71	3.91	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.79	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.01	3.83	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	4.28	4.24	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.16	3.99	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.03	3.86	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	3.42	3.66	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 215	4.26	4.31	4.36	4.21	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	178/ 228	4.30	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 217	4.46	4.52	4.51	4.45	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 216	4.44	4.32	4.42	4.35	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	141/ 205	4.17	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 401 0101
 Title CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 352
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1032/1522	4.09	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	682/1285	4.36	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1293/1476	3.57	3.82	4.22	4.31	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	5	2	0	2.45	1389/1412	2.45	3.91	4.06	4.11	2.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	977/1381	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.21	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	670/1500	4.36	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	264/1497	4.21	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	512/1440	4.56	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	4.90	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1008/1436	3.85	3.99	4.29	4.32	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	847/1432	3.93	3.86	4.29	4.34	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1133/1221	2.78	3.66	3.93	4.04	2.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	6				
			? 0						

Course-Section: CHEM 401 0101
 Title CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMICS
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A. (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 353
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	669/1522	4.45	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1032/1522	4.09	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	682/1285	4.36	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1293/1476	3.57	3.82	4.22	4.31	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	5	2	0	2.45	1389/1412	2.45	3.91	4.06	4.11	2.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	977/1381	3.86	3.76	4.08	4.21	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	670/1500	4.36	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1147/1497	4.21	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	931/1440	4.56	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	765/1448	4.90	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1261/1436	3.85	3.99	4.29	4.32	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	0	4	2	3.56	1256/1432	3.93	3.86	4.29	4.34	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	0	3	0	2.80	1121/1221	2.78	3.66	3.93	4.04	2.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 431 0101
 Title CHEMISTRY OF PROTEINS
 Instructor: GARVIE, COLIN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 354
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	694/1522	4.43	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	9	7	3.86	1211/1522	3.86	3.95	4.26	4.34	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	9	8	3.96	982/1285	3.96	3.94	4.30	4.42	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1349/1476	3.40	3.82	4.22	4.31	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1412	****	3.91	4.06	4.11	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	3	0	2	3	3.33	1227/1381	3.33	3.76	4.08	4.21	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	892/1500	4.14	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	7	4.35	1201/1517	4.35	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	839/1497	4.10	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	565/1440	4.70	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	1182/1448	4.48	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	9	9	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	17	4.52	611/1432	4.52	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	4	2	14	4.38	373/1221	4.38	3.66	3.93	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	10
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 431H 0101
 Title CHEMISTRY OF PROTEINS
 Instructor: GARVIE, COLIN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 355
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.02	4.30	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	3.95	4.26	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	3.94	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	3.82	4.22	4.31	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	3.76	4.08	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	3.91	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	3.83	4.11	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.24	4.45	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.40	4.71	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	3.99	4.29	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	3.86	4.29	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.66	3.93	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0

Required for Majors 0

General 0

Electives 0

Other 0

Graduate 0

Under-grad 1

Major 0

Non-major 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 356
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.80	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	545/1522	4.64	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.62	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	473/1476	4.51	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1287/1412	3.49	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.24	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1500	4.95	3.91	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1268/1517	4.41	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	189/1497	4.27	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	4.58	4.24	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.40	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	793/1436	4.40	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	820/1432	4.39	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	175/1221	4.48	3.66	3.93	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	718/1280	3.94	3.73	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1214/1277	3.89	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	875/1269	4.33	3.68	4.31	4.49	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.31	4.36	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 228	4.97	4.38	4.35	4.32	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.52	4.51	4.55	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.32	4.42	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	96/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: ZHU, GUOZHANG (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 357
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.80	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	545/1522	4.64	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.62	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	473/1476	4.51	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1287/1412	3.49	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.24	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1500	4.95	3.91	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1268/1517	4.41	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.27	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.38	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.40	4.71	4.75	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	718/1280	3.94	3.73	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1214/1277	3.89	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	875/1269	4.33	3.68	4.31	4.49	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.31	4.36	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 228	4.97	4.38	4.35	4.32	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.52	4.51	4.55	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.32	4.42	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	96/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 358
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	218/1522	4.80	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	222/1522	4.64	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	298/1285	4.62	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	454/1476	4.51	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	1	9	3.72	1037/1412	3.49	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	361/1381	4.24	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	114/1500	4.95	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1019/1517	4.41	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	280/1497	4.27	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1440	4.58	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1448	4.81	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	74/1436	4.40	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	240/1432	4.39	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	119/1221	4.48	3.66	3.93	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	834/1280	3.94	3.73	4.10	4.28	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	351/1277	3.89	3.94	4.34	4.50	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	461/1269	4.33	3.68	4.31	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	166/ 854	4.60	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.31	4.36	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	19/ 228	4.97	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.52	4.51	4.55	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.32	4.42	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	46/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BLOCKLIN, ADRIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 359
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	218/1522	4.80	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	222/1522	4.64	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	298/1285	4.62	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	454/1476	4.51	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	1	9	3.72	1037/1412	3.49	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	361/1381	4.24	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	114/1500	4.95	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1019/1517	4.41	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1192/1497	4.27	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	1	2	6	3.75	1304/1440	4.58	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	1307/1448	4.81	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	0	2	1	7	3.92	1147/1436	4.40	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	1	1	2	0	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.39	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	606/1221	4.48	3.66	3.93	4.04	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	834/1280	3.94	3.73	4.10	4.28	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	351/1277	3.89	3.94	4.34	4.50	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	461/1269	4.33	3.68	4.31	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	166/ 854	4.60	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.31	4.36	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	19/ 228	4.97	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.52	4.51	4.55	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.32	4.42	4.20	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	46/ 205	4.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAME (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 360
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	6	7	25	4.44	694/1522	4.44	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	7	12	16	4.08	1042/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	13	16	4.05	910/1285	4.05	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	5	4	7	12	3.83	1164/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.31	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	4	9	11	10	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	11	0	4	5	4	11	3.92	924/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	4.21	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	9	12	11	3.89	1099/1500	3.89	3.91	4.18	4.25	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	19	16	4.46	1120/1517	4.46	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	7	10	14	4.09	839/1497	3.87	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	6	26	4.50	798/1440	4.62	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	6	29	4.63	1036/1448	4.65	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	2	15	17	4.24	886/1436	4.12	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	8	23	4.32	829/1432	4.22	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	3	7	1	9	11	3.58	867/1221	3.66	3.66	3.93	4.04	3.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	3	1	2	4	1	2.91	1226/1280	2.91	3.73	4.10	4.28	2.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1082/1277	3.70	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1162/1269	3.30	3.68	4.31	4.49	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	7	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	10	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	34				
				?	4						

Course-Section: CHEM 438 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 361
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	6	7	25	4.44	694/1522	4.44	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	7	12	16	4.08	1042/1522	4.08	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	6	13	16	4.05	910/1285	4.05	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	5	4	7	12	3.83	1164/1476	3.83	3.82	4.22	4.31	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	4	9	11	10	3.71	1045/1412	3.71	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	11	0	4	5	4	11	3.92	924/1381	3.92	3.76	4.08	4.21	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	3	9	12	11	3.89	1099/1500	3.89	3.91	4.18	4.25	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	19	16	4.46	1120/1517	4.46	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	12	13	5	3.66	1210/1497	3.87	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	492/1440	4.62	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	5	27	4.68	989/1448	4.65	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	4	4	14	12	4.00	1056/1436	4.12	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	4	11	16	4.12	984/1432	4.22	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	2	4	4	10	10	3.73	797/1221	3.66	3.66	3.93	4.04	3.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	3	1	2	4	1	2.91	1226/1280	2.91	3.73	4.10	4.28	2.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1082/1277	3.70	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	1162/1269	3.30	3.68	4.31	4.49	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	7	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	39	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.38	4.35	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	40
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	10	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	34				
				?	4						

Course-Section: CHEM 453 0101
 Title ORG CHEM NUCL ACID
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 362
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	453/1522	4.65	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	686/1522	4.41	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	509/1285	4.53	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	435/1476	4.55	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	4	5	3.41	1219/1412	3.41	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	743/1381	4.11	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	463/1500	4.53	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	385/1497	4.50	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	224/1440	4.88	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.40	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	896/1436	4.24	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	611/1432	4.53	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	832/1221	3.67	3.66	3.93	4.04	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1280	****	3.73	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1277	****	3.94	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1269	****	3.68	4.31	4.49	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	3	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 461 0101
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 363
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	433/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	787/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	366/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	792/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1127/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	189/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	224/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	263/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	454/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	606/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1136/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1030/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	63/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	135/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	123/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	194/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
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	0	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	7
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: GAPEEV, ALEXEI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 364
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	433/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	787/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	366/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	792/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1127/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	0	0	2.71	1464/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1349/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1429/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	1378/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1364/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1188/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1136/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1030/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	63/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	135/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	123/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	194/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
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	0	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	7
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 365
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	433/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	787/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	366/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	792/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1127/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1174/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1112/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1419/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1364/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	1364/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1188/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1136/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1030/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	63/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	135/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	123/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	194/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
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	0	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	7
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 366
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	433/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	787/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	366/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	792/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1127/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	413/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	435/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	767/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1418/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1276/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1419/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1282/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1320/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1188/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	988/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1136/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1030/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	63/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	135/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	123/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	194/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
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	0	D	1						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	7
?	1		

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 367
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1013/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	575/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	362/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	295/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	83/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	116/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	123/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	108/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	100/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	141/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 367
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: GAPEEV, ALEXEI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 368
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1013/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	575/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	362/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1112/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1157/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1056/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	949/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	606/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	116/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	123/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	108/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	100/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	141/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: GAPEEV, ALEXEI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 368
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 369
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1013/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	575/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	362/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1057/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	798/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1157/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	934/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	949/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	606/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	116/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	123/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	108/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	100/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	141/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: MENDEZ, MIGUEL (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 369
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 370
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	4.83	4.02	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.60	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.71	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.38	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1013/1412	3.66	3.91	4.06	4.11	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	575/1381	4.36	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	362/1500	4.59	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.89	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	6	0	3.50	1277/1497	3.74	3.83	4.11	4.21	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	798/1440	4.33	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1448	4.23	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	934/1436	3.95	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1270/1432	3.85	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1148/1221	3.32	3.66	3.93	4.04	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	286/1280	4.13	3.73	4.10	4.28	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	4.38	3.68	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.92	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	116/ 215	4.52	4.31	4.36	4.47	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	123/ 228	4.35	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	108/ 217	4.54	4.52	4.51	4.55	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	100/ 216	3.81	4.32	4.42	4.20	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	141/ 205	3.50	4.23	4.23	3.85	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.50	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.50	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.50	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	5.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	5.00	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.50	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102
 Title ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 370
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490 0101
 Title SPEC TOPICS IN CHEM SP
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 371
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	246/1522	4.81	4.02	4.30	4.42	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	592/1522	4.48	3.95	4.26	4.34	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	509/1285	4.52	3.94	4.30	4.42	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	903/1476	4.16	3.82	4.22	4.31	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	3	9	4.05	728/1412	4.05	3.91	4.06	4.11	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	434/1381	4.40	3.76	4.08	4.21	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	312/1500	4.67	3.91	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.79	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	240/1497	4.69	3.83	4.11	4.21	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	452/1440	4.75	4.24	4.45	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	296/1448	4.95	4.40	4.71	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	132/1436	4.89	3.99	4.29	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	97/1432	4.95	3.86	4.29	4.34	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	480/1221	4.22	3.66	3.93	4.04	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	390/1280	4.50	3.73	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	804/1277	4.25	3.94	4.34	4.50	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	586/1269	4.50	3.68	4.31	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	402/ 854	4.13	3.92	4.02	4.31	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.31	4.36	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 9
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		